The African Communist

NO 67 FOURTH QUARTER 1976

OUTH AFRICA IN REVOLT

INKULULEKO PUBLICATIONS

Distributors of *The African Communist*

PRICE AND SUBSCRIPTION

AFRICA	*15p per copy* *60p per year post free* *Airmail £5.00 per year* (Nigerian subscribers can send 1 Naira 20 Kobo to our agent at KPS Bookshop, PMB 23, Afikpo, Imo State)
BRITAIN	*25p per copy* *£1.00 per year post free*
ALL OTHER COUNTRIES	*$1.00 per copy* *$4.00 per year post free* *Airmail $10.00 per year. US currency*

INKULULEKO PUBLICATIONS, 39 Goodge Street, London W.1.

THE AFRICAN COMMUNIST

Published quarterly in the interests of African solidarity, and as a forum for Marxist-Leninist thought throughout our Continent, by the South African Communist Party

No. 67 Fourth Quarter 1976

CONTENTS

5 **EDITORIAL NOTES**
South Africa in Revolt; The Transkei Sham; A Renegade Expelled; Europe's Communists Meet.

20 **TRUE LIBERATION NEEDS A STRONG WORKING CLASS**
Message to the workers from the South African Communist Party – leaflet distributed underground by our apparatus in South Africa.

William Pomeroy
26 **THE "NEW" U.S. POLICY IN AFRICA**
The United States is playing an increasing interventionist role in Southern Africa in a bid to hold back the progress of the liberation movements.

Phineas Malinga
36 **S.A. IMPERIALISM – THE BALANCE SHEET FOR 1976**
The Vorster regime is changing its policies to take into account the changed circumstances in Africa since he first propounded his policy of "dialogue".

David Davis
41 **ECONOMY STRANGLED BY COLOUR BARS**
Every economic struggle becomes a political struggle as the deepening crisis places the industrial colour bar under increasing strain.

Joe Ngwenya
48 **A FURTHER CONTRIBUTION ON THE NATIONAL QUESTION**
Contribution from a reader to the discussion on the national question. Earlier articles appeared in The African Communist *issues No. 64 and 66.*

David Evans

60 AFRICAN PROMETHEUS – a Poem

The author, who was sentenced to five years' imprisonment for "sabotage" in 1964, dedicates his poem to Bram Fischer, Nelson Mandela and other South African fighters against apartheid.

Dialego

63 PHILOSOPHY AND CLASS STRUGGLE:
1. Why Revolutionaries Need Marxism.

This is the first in a series of four articles intended to introduce the reader to the basic elements of dialectical and historical materialism.

73 BOOK REVIEWS

Class Struggles in Tanzania, *by Issa G. Shivji;* Chibaro: African Mine Labour in Southern Rhodesia 1900-33, *by Charles van Onselen;* Urban Man in Southern Africa, *edited by Clive Kileff and Wade C. Pendleton;* Aspects of a Far-off Land, *by A.B. Davidson and V.A. Makrushin;* Moses Kotane, South African Revolutionary, *by Brian Bunting.*

86 DOCUMENT
FORCED LABOUR FOR COLOURED WORKERS

A memorandum prepared by the Campaign Against Racial Discrimination, Cape Town.

SOUTH AFRICA IN REVOLT

The Soweto massacre of last June occurred just after our last issue, No. 66, had gone to press – a fact we mention to explain why the issue, though appearing some weeks later, contained no mention of the most cataclysmic event to occur in South Africa since Sharpeville, in 1960. And, as events have since proved, it is wrong to speak of Soweto in the past tense, as though it is something over and done with, and the dead, counted and buried, may rest in peace. As these notes are being written the rumblings of the volcano which erupted at Soweto are still to be heard, all over the country. In Soweto itself there has been another popular upsurge, with 30,000 people courageously defying police terror in a bid to march on Johannesburg and demand the release of their comrades from the torture chambers of John Vorster Square. Every-

where the African people, fired by the incredible bravery of their youth, are on the march. The three segregated African universities are still shut, schools all over the country still empty or boycotted, demonstrations spreading from one centre to another. The African people are making it plain that they will not submit to apartheid and Bantustans, that there must be an end to oppression and exploitation, that there will be no peace until the people's demands for full rights of nationhood and citizenship are satisfied.

It is impossible to tell the story of Soweto in statistics alone. The Government's admission that 176 Africans were killed in the initial outbreak is a ludicrous understatement. According to our information literally hundreds of Africans were shot down in cold blood at various places where disturbances took place at that time, that thousands were injured, thousands more arrested and still being brought before the courts in a steady stream. We are not interested in any report which the one-man commission of Mr Justice Cillie may issue after making up his mind largely on the basis of the evidence placed before him by the police and other agents of officialdom. We know what we know, and we know our young boys and girls were shot down for demonstrating against the Government's racist language policy, for demonstrating against racism and exploitation, for demonstrating against taxation without representation, for demonstrating against the monstrous policy of apartheid and "separate development" which is blighting their lives and stunting their future.

We know that black South Africans, because they have no votes, are despised and ignored by the Government and the majority of whites and have to demonstrate and die before anybody is prepared to take notice of them. It was not until hundreds of our young people were killed and thousands lying bleeding and maimed in the streets that the Government relaxed (temporarily) its Afrikaans language policy and tried to appease our anger by promising to electrify Soweto within the next 10 years. We remember that the Government "relaxed" the pass laws at the time of Sharpeville, and are not going to be fooled by these "concessions".

It is useless for the Government to try to reduce the issue of Soweto to a matter of school language and electricity. We know that the Government's whole education policy, including Bantu Education, is designed to achieve two main objectives: 1. The dominance of the Afrikaners over the English amongst the whites; and 2. The dominance of the whites over the blacks in Southern Africa as a whole. While the police shoot us down with their bullets in the streets and squares where

we meet, the agents of the government are trying to shoot us down intellectually in the classrooms, to train us for serfdom, to induce in us a belief in the white man's superiority and our own inferiority.

The African people have shown again and again that they will not submit to apartheid and oppression, and now the African youth are voicing their protest in the very places in which the Government was hoping to quell it – in the segregated schools and universities. Even in the Bantustans, the stooge administrations placed in power by the Vorster Government have rejected the Bantu Education policy. This is why the world must understand that the significance of Soweto and its aftermath goes far beyond the issues of language and schools. Our people died not merely for the right to study in English, but for the right to nationhood, for full and equal rights in the land of their birth. They died to protest against the Government's plan to divide up the country on ethnic lines, forcing every African into citizenship of the impoverished reserves, stealing from them the wealth they have created with their labour. Coming only months before the proclamation of the "independence" of the Transkei on October 26, Soweto has at a stroke refuted Vorster's claim that Bantustans are what the African want, that through the Bantustans the Government is bestowing on them the freedom they want to rule themselves "on their own lines".

The Bantustans have been forced down the throats of the African people just as the Government tried to force Afrikaans down their throats in schools. When the Bantustan plan is completed, the Government will proclaim all the black "natives" to be "foreigners" in South Africa, and by some magic all the white "foreigners" will be proclaimed the only true and genuine "natives". The African people of Soweto have shown they will never accept this. Nor is the African protest confined to the towns, or to any one ethnic group. The protests and demonstrations have taken place in both town and country, in every province, in so-called "white" South Africa as well as in the reserves. And we can guarantee that when the stooge governments come to power in the "independent" Bantustans, and attempt to apply the apartheid policies on behalf of the South African Government, the fight will be waged against them as bitterly as it is waged against Vorster himself.

The Government's response to the Soweto and other disturbances has been a massive new round of arrests, detentions and trials, using its vast powers under the Internal Security Act, which is the new name, especially introduced during the last session of Parliament, for the Suppression of Communism Act first passed in 1950. We forecast at the

time that the Suppression of Communism Act, directed ostensibly against Communists, would become the Government's main instrument of attack against all those who opposed its apartheid policies; and in fact the vast majority of those penalised under the Suppression Act, whether by way of banning, detention or trial, were not Communists. By changing the name of the Act, the Government has tacitly admitted that anti-Communism was merely an excuse to justify its resort to the arbitrary and brutal methods of the police state in putting down all forms of opposition to its tyrannical policies.

Links in a Chain

The events of the last few months have demonstrated convincingly that Vorster's resort to the bullet and the baton will not succeed in cowing the people. Soweto is not an isolated example of African disaffection, but one link in a chain of African revolt which stretches back over all the decades since Union was proclaimed in 1910. As the years have passed, this revolt has grown in scope and intensity as the process of urbanisation and politicisation of the African masses has been speeded up. Since the end of the second world war we have witnessed, inter alia, the African mineworkers' strike of 1946, the Defiance Campaign of 1952, the Freedom Charter campaign of 1955, the bus boycotts and political strikes as well as the treason trial of the late fifties, the Sharpeville explosion of 1960, the resort to sabotage and armed struggle during the 1960s.

During the middle-sixties the Government succeeded in muting the protest by greatly extending its network of spies and informers, encouraging the use of torture in the jails and generally sharpening all its instruments of state terror. But despite those difficulties our liberation front remained true to the policy of "no surrender". The forces of Umkhonto we Sizwe fought heroically in their battles against Vorster's mercenaries in Zimbabwe and in the most unfavourable circumstances worked ceaselessly to help create conditions in which our enemy could be confronted in armed combat inside our country. Our courageous underground workers were continuously seen by our people to be risking life, imprisonment and torture in their attempts to rebuild our movement and to stimulate the mood of resistance. The street broadcasts, the leaflet bombs and the unending stream of ANC and Communist Party propaganda and organisational material kept alive the spirit of resistance and revolt and helped the new generation to understand the revolutionary content and perspectives of our struggle.

But the upsurge in the tide of revolt which the years of the present decade have seen is also in response to events in the external world like the liberation of Angola and Mozambique. Partly, also, it is stimulated by the continual erosion of African living standards through inflation and the ruthless implementation of influx control. Today the African masses are hungry and angry, their physical life stunted or mutilated, their national pride and dignity insulted and humiliated. No one can fail to see the grand sweep of the strike movement which started in Namibia in 1971 and spread to one centre after another of South Africa in the ensuing years. And perhaps the most significant feature of this strike wave has been that for almost the first time in decades it is getting results. As a result of the Government's own policy of "de-blacking" the towns, employers are suffering from a shortage of all kinds of labour, at the very same time as the reserves are crammed with an estimated 2 million unemployed. It is no longer possible to replace an African worker quickly and easily, and the employers are showing an inclination to hang on to their work force, even at the cost of increased wages, rather than lose them through a strike and be forced to go through the cumbersome process of recruiting a new supply in the reserves. Even on the mines African cash wages have had to be substantially increased in recent years in order to attract more labour from South Africa to replace foreign labour which has become more scarce (and, it is feared, a potential source of political disaffection) as a result of developments in neighbouring countries.

This is not to suggest that conditions of life for the African people as a whole are improving. They are not. Such statistics as are available apply only to a minority of Africans working in industries covered by industrial conciliation agreements or wage board determinations, and even these statistics show that the gap between the living standards of white and black is growing wider with every passing year. Side by side with unimagined opulence amongst large sections of the white community goes the impoverishment of the masses, the overwhelming majority of whom live below the breadline, in conditions of appalling squalor. And above all, the African is everywhere denied any say in determining the policies by which he is governed, and rendered ever more insecure by the Government's ruthless implementation of its Bantustan policies. Now the African people are making it clear they have had enough.

We salute the brave youth who carry the flag of freedom in South Africa today. They wear the colours and sing the songs, shout the slogans of the African National Congress. Their spirit and courage are an inspiration to all our people fighting against apartheid, to lovers of free-

dom and democracy everywhere in the world. So long as our young people show they are prepared to fight and die for liberty and justice we have no fears for the future of our country.

Equally encouraging are the signs that the mass of the African people stand solidly behind the liberation movement and the policy of armed struggle which is pointing the way to the future. Though the Communist Party was banned in 1950 and the ANC in 1960, the people still regard as their true leaders those men and women who have been killed, jailed, banned or exiled for trying to implement the aims of the Freedom Charter. The cowards and compromisers who pleaded for dialogue with Vorster, or acceptance of Bantustan, have been pushed aside, and in the current upsurges we are witnessing the flowering of the spirit of resistance which communists and congressmen have been fighting and sacrificing to keep alive during the intensified oppression of the last 15 years. The manifesto with which Umkhonto we Sizwe first announced its existence in December 16, 1961, declared:

"The people's patience is not endless. The time comes in the life of any nation when there remain only two choices – submit or fight. That time has now come to South Africa".

Now, after Soweto, the torturers and murderers of Vorster's security police, the hounders and hunters, the policemen who beat and bully, the midnight pass raiders, the men whose hands are stained with the blood of our martyrs, know they have failed. Our young boys and girls still shout "Amandla Ngawethu", knowing it is true, because they have seen and felt their power in action, and they know the future belongs to them.

The Soweto manifestation has had a profound effect not only internally but externally as well. Vorster's policy of dialogue with Africa lies shattered and in ruins, and his bid to secure international backing for his foreign and domestic policies has been seriously undermined. With Rhodesia in flames and the UN ultimatum to South Africa over the future of Namibia about to run out, Vorster had been making desperate attempts to impose, with the aid of the imperialists, a "Pax Vorsteriana" on all Southern Africa which would guarantee the future of white domination. For a time he appeared to be having some success. In recent years, the capitalist world, in the throes of economic recession, has witnessed a recrudescence of fascist and racist trends and movements which undoubtedly has had its effect on the political scene, leading in some countries – Britain for example – to open identification by "respectable" right-wing forces with the regimes of Smith and Vorster. The reverses suffered by imperialism in Asia and Africa, and especially

in Angola, have also led to moves to incorporate South Africa within the framework of NATO and other reactionary military blocs attempting to preserve Africa as a neo-colonialist stamping ground under the pretext of protecting it from "international Communist aggression". It is in this context that the Kissinger-Vorster negotiations for a Southern African settlement must be viewed, based on the notion that collaboration with apartheid South Africa is not just inevitable but even desirable, given that the alternative is an African continent firmly fixed on the road to socialism.

This does not mean, however, that mankind as a whole is prepared to tolerate the abomination of apartheid. On the contrary, recent events such as the expulsion of South Africa from a number of international sporting federations and the whole furore at the Olympics over the New Zealand rugby tour of South Africa show that world indignation against apartheid South Africa is rising to a peak. The African uprising in Soweto and elsewhere has rendered the imperialist plan to collaborate with South Africa infinitely more difficult to put into effect except by the most covert and secretive methods.

An Opportunity and A Challenge

At the same time, the events in Soweto present the liberation movement with an opportunity which must be taken if the aspirations of the masses are to be realised. The hideous toll of death and destruction in Soweto and elsewhere is not merely an indictment of white domination and repression, but a challenge to the people and their organisations. a call for effective action and leadership which must not be ignored. In this context we associate ourselves wholeheartedly with the editorial "Bloody Wednesday" in *Amandla-Matla*, the newsletter of the African National Congress, which was circulated throughout South Africa immediately after the June shootings in Soweto. It reads as follows:

Wednesday, the 16th of June will go down in the annals of the history of South Africa as a day of wholesale massacre of innocent, peaceful and unarmed children demonstrators by the bloody and murderous police of Vorster. This cold-blooded murder, which at the time of going to the press had already claimed a hundred lives of both old and young and a thousand in wounded, is another criminal instance of genocide on top of others that are occurring with increasing frequency in our country.

What crime did these African children commit? Our children died because they dared to express a wish to be taught in the language of

their choice. The fascists could not countenance this decisive action by the oppressed Black children and wrongly hoped that their bullets would frighten them away from action.

To Vorster and his Western imperialist friends who arm him, we say: the ruthless killing and maiming of the oppressed will not shake our determination to overthrow your Apartheid regime. Already, the killings have united the Black people, young and old and they are demanding their freedom now. We further say: we shall continue to defy your machine-guns and murder squads, with even greater determination. We shall organise better; we shall arm ourselves; we shall consolidate our forces to make sure that your crimes do not go unpunished. These racist murderers who are so eager to machine-gun unarmed kids and women took to their heels when they came face to face with armed freedom fighters of Umkhonto weSizwe in Zimbabwe in 1967 and 1968. Their bravado and swagger vanished completely when our MPLA comrades trounced them in Angola.

Comrades and Countrymen, this is not the time to weep over our fallen heroes. It is time to hit back at the enemy with everything we have got. It is time to be more skilful and strike at him in small groups so as to vanish quickly. It is time to hit where he is weak and least prepared. Let us avoid concentrating in big numbers and deprive him of visible targets. Let us disperse him and scatter his forces by hitting at the same time in Cape Town, Pretoria, Port Elizabeth, Bloemfontein, East London, Maritzburg and other places. Let us make him confused so that he should not know where next we will attack. The African National Congress which leads the national liberation struggle in our country has created its military wing, Umkhonto weSizwe to provide you with the art of fighting. Let us therefore join Umkhonto in even bigger numbers and train so as to become better fighters. Bloody Wednesday has shown the urgency of our task to smash Vorster's regime of terror and violence.

Countrymen and Comrades, you have already shown your guts and determination. With such courage and unity, our victory is assured. Therefore, in order to have our effective and merciless revenge, let us prepare ourselves secretly in small groups and get in touch with our organisation. The ANC is there and lives amongst you. Let us convert our anger into revolutionary action; with heads high let us all follow the example of Soweto and the rest of the Reef, Ngoye, Thabong, Turfloop, Gugulethu, Nyanga, Edenvale Coloured Township, Wentworth etc., and harass the enemy on all fronts.

The African National Congress dips it revolutionary banner in

memory of all those comrades who have fallen in the heroic battle. They have not died in vain and the oppressed will continue the battle until victory is achieved. To all of you, we say: Forward, brave fighters! Maintain the revolutionary unity displayed by the Witwatersrand University students and workers' demonstration and by demonstrations at the universities of Cape Town and Natal. The blood of our people has made us stronger and more determined, and the struggle continues.
FATHERLAND OR DEATH! VICTORY IS CERTAIN!
AMANDLA NGAWETHU!

THE TRANSKEI SHAM

The Transkei is destined to receive its "independence" from the South African Government on October 26 this year. Several weeks before that date the Government was trying to pave the way for Matanzima's accession to power by locking up all his opponents under the provisions of the emergency Proclamation R400, first proclaimed to deal with the Pondoland rebellion of 1960 and maintained in force ever since at the request of Matanzima himself, who admitted he could not remain in power without it.

In an attempt to give an air of legitimacy to his "government" Matanzima ordered elections to be held before independence – and made sure he and his friends would win the elections by incarcerating the leadership of the opposition Democratic Party, thereby preventing their names from appearing on the ballot. Thus it is clear that from the word "go" Matanzima intends to rule by force because the majority of the Transkeian people, wherever they live and work, are totally opposed to the separation of the Transkei from South Africa. They insist that South Africa with all its wealth belongs as much to them as to anybody else, and reject the proposed constitution which automatically deprives them of South African citizenship the moment the Transkei becomes an "independent state".

Up to the time of independence Matanzima was able to impose his will on the people of the Transkei through the medium of the South African police. After independence his instrument is apparently to be the new army trained for him by his South African masters. In a speech in Queenstown in July, Matanzima said all able-bodied men between 18 and 60 would have to undergo compulsory military training. Emphasising that he needed an army not for attack but for defence, he made it clear that the enemy he feared was, not South Africa, but people he

called "terrorists" – in other words, the freedom fighters of Umkhonto and the ANC.

Matanzima also made it clear that he expects the "terrorists" to come, not from outside his borders, but from the ranks of the people of the Transkei themselves.

"At the first sign of terrorism", he said, "I will have the men responsible in uniform, – and serving in my army depot near Umtata."

The mobilisation into the army and placing under military discipline of strikers and other dissidents is a well-known device used by the dictatorships of Spain, Chile and other anti-democratic regimes to crush all forms of opposition to their rule. Matanzima is announcing to the world that he can only remain in power by the use of the same nefarious tactics.

The South African Government has spent millions preparing to foist its Transkei abortion on the world as a legitimate birth, and is spending millions more in propaganda designed to persuade the world to accept the Transkei as the first stage of its Bantustan programme to grant full "freedom" to the African people. There may be states, in Africa and the western world, who will recognise the Transkei government because they wish to please South Africa and secure some of its lucrative contracts. They should be left in no doubt that if they sink so low they will offend the overwhelming majority not only of the peoples of South Africa, but also of Africa and the world as reflected in resolutions passed by the Organisation of African Unity and the United Nations.

In this context we draw to the attention of our readers the text of a resolution passed by the Council of Ministers of the OAU at their meeting in Port Louis, Mauritius, last July:

Resolution of Non-Recognition of South African Bantustans

The Council of Ministers meeting in its Twenty Seventh Ordinary Session in Port Louis, Mauritius from 24th to 3rd July, 1976.

Considering that the Pretoria regime is accelerating its policy of Bantustanisation, the cornerstone of apartheid designed to ensure the balkanisation tribal fragmentation and fratricidal conflict in South Africa to the benefit of white supremacy;

Reaffirming the OAU's sacred commitment to the principles of territorial and national integrity of all territories under foreign domination and fighting for liberation and self determination:

Recalling previous resolutions of the OAU the non-aligned movement and the United Nations against the Bantustan policy,

1. *Reaffirms* the OAU's condemnation and the rejection of the Bantustan policy and urges all member states to refrain from establishing contact with the emissaries of the so-called Bantu Homelands:

2. *Invites all States and in particular* member states of the OAU in their totality not to accord recognition to any Bantustan, in particular, the Transkei whose so-called independence is scheduled for the 26th October, 1976;
3. *Declares* that violation of this collective commitment by any member state will be seen as a betrayal of not only the fighting people of South Africa but the entire continent;
4. *Commits* the OAU through the General Secretariat, the African group at the United Nations and African diplomatic representatives throughout the world to wage a concerted campaign to dissuade all U.N. member states from recognizing this fraudulent pseudo independence.

In another resolution the Council of Ministers called on all governments and organisations to observe October 26 as "a day of solidarity with the peoples of South Africa and Namibia in their struggle against Bantustans and for the territorial integrity of their nations".

A RENEGADE EXPELLED

The Central Committe of the South African Communist Party has unanimously decided to expel Vincent Joseph (Joe) Matthews from its ranks.

The basis of the decision of the Central Committee is an interview given by Matthews to the "Sunday Times" on April 18, 1976, in which he has repudiated not only the immediate programme but also the basic policies of the South African Communist Party. He has in effect turned his back on the liberation movement and declared himself an adherent of a policy of dialogue with the Vorster Government.

Matthews' justification for his change of policy is that " the balance of power (in South Africa) has shifted in favour of those calling for change against those who wish to maintain the status quo . . . The 15-year-old policy of armed confrontation is, in fact, hampering the full mobilisation of the people for a purposeful exploitation of the opportunities for reform that have arisen".

He criticises the "anti-West" and "pro-Communist" posture of the ANC, while at the same time falsely claiming that he was never a member of the South African Communist Party.

We have no wish to enter into a polemic with the renegade Matthews. He has chosen the path of opportunism and personal advancement in preference to that of struggle, and history has already passed judgment on him though the events which have developed from

the courageous demonstration of Soweto schoolchildren against Bantu Education and apartheid oppression.

The Communist Party has no room in its ranks for opportunists and renegades. Matthews' betrayal of everything he stood for and the comrades he worked with during his long membership of the Communist Party makes his present action more reprehensible,and the Central Committee takes the earliest opportunity to declare its condemnation of and disgust at the course of compromise, appeasement and surrender he has chosen to follow.

EUROPE'S COMMUNISTS MEET

The conference of 29 Communist and Workers' Parties which took place in Berlin, the capital of the German Democratic Republic, on June 29 and 30, 1976, was an event of fundamental significance, not only for Europe, but for the peoples of the whole world.

In the first place, it was the most representative conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties to be held since the 1950s, bringing together the leading representatives of the most progressive forces on the European continent, and uniting them within the terms of reference of a document which signposted the way towards the achievement of "peace, security, co-operation and social progress in Europe".

It is well-known that there are differences of approach on the part of many of the participants at the conference – differences not only over methods of achieving socialism, but also over the nature and meaning of socialism itself. To many inside and outside the international Communist movement it may have appeared that these differences were irreconcilable. There were those in the Communist camp who feared that the holding of a conference would merely emphasise the differences and who seemed to prefer not to hold a conference if it was to succeed only in advertising to the world their failure to reach agreement. On the other hand, bourgeois politicians and commentators seeking to promote disunity in the ranks of the Communist movement seized on every disagreement and gleefully forecast not only that the conference would never be held, but also that this failure in itself would represent the beginning of the end of international Communist unity which they quite rightly regard as the main challenge to the continuance of the bourgeois system and its manifestations in the form of imperialism, neo-colonialism, racism and other forms of domination

and exploitation of the majority in the interests of the privileged minority.

From this point of view the mere holding of the conference constituted a resounding defeat for the enemies of progress in Europe and the world. And the top-level representation at the conference was an indication of the seriousness with which the participants regard the problem of achieving unity in the Communist camp. Some commentators have been inclined to belittle the conference as "just another stunt" and the document produced by the conference as "mere word-spinning". This is a gross underestimation of the significance of the conference and the document which emanated from its discussions. No doubt the document is a compromise. No doubt it does not represent the totality of the viewpoint of any single delegation. But it nevertheless marks a historic step in the direction of common endeavour by the parties of Europe.

The conference document starts off by declaring: "The representatives of these Parties exchanged their views on a limited range of questions relating to the struggle for peace, security, co-operation and social progress in Europe", and then added the vital words: "Each of the participating parties is willing to help achieve these aims". And later: "They will develop their internationalist, comradely and voluntary co-operation and solidarity on the basis of the great ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin, strictly adhering to the principles of equality and sovereign independence of each Party, non-interference in internal affairs, and respect for their free choice of different roads in the struggle for social change of a progressive nature and for socialism".

This is not only an affirmation of the need for international communist solidarity, but a stinging rebuff for the tendency in some quarters to promote the concept of the independence of parties at the expense of the concept of internationalism. The document emphasises: "The struggle of each Party for socialism in its own country and its responsibility towards the working class and the people of that country are bound up with mutual solidarity among working people of all countries and all progressive movements and peoples in their struggle for freedom and the strengthening of their independence, for democracy, socialism and world peace".

If it is necessary to emphasise the need for international Communist solidarity at a time when the world has just witnessed the liberation of Vietnam and Angola (to name only the two most striking of many recent examples) not only through the glorious struggle and self-sacrifice of their own fighting peoples, but also through the effective

solidarity actions of the international Communist movement, then the document of the Berlin conference has done so. The Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe have, by meeting, acted and, through their document, indicated their determination to continue to act in the spirit of international solidarity to achieve their common objectives of peace, security and socialism. The document has also indicated that the unity of the Communist and Workers' Parties is the base on which can be built the unity of wider democratic forces which share the same objectives:

"The Communist and Workers' Parties are aware that a Europe of peace and progress can only be the result of many-sided efforts, and the outcome of rapprochement, understanding and co-operation among the broadest political and social forces. They consider dialogue and co-operation between Communists and all other democratic and peace-loving forces as necessary. In this, they base themselves on what they all have in common, and stand for the removal of mistrust and prejudices which may hamper co-operation."

Although the conference concentrated its attention on Europe, the delegates stressed that the achievement of their goals would be a vital contribution for the achievement of peace, security and social progress in the whole world, and not least for the implementation of the provisions of the Helsinki agreement.

"They state with all clarity that the policy of peaceful coexistence, active co-operation between states irrespective of their social systems, and international detente correspond both to the interests of each people, as well as to the cause of progress for the whole of mankind, and in no way mean the maintenance of the political and social status quo in the various countries, but on the contrary create optimum conditions for the struggle of the working class and all democratic forces as well as for the implementation of the inalienable right of each and every people freely to choose and follow its own course of development for the struggle against the rule of the monopolies and for socialism."

Since the peace and progress of Europe are inseparable from the peace and progress of the world, on the lines laid down in the document, it follows logically that steps should now be taken for the convening of an international conference of Communist and Workers' Parties for the implementation of the same aims on a world scale. No doubt there will be problems. Some of these will be the same as those experienced in the convening of the European Communist conference – the problem of co-ordinating the views and perspectives of parties at various levels of development, some in the socialist countries exercising

state power and influence, some enjoying massive electoral support with the prospect of achieving power through a united front or parliamentary coalition, some very small and politically isolated, some illegal. But if these problems could be overcome in Europe they can be overcome on the world stage. The urgent necessity is, in the words of the European Communist document, to "base themselves on what they all have in common", to strive to achieve the maximum unity in the struggle against world imperialism. To refuse to tackle these problems for fear of failure is to surrender to the enemy the most effective weapon of the working classes of the world – international proletarian solidarity on the basis of the great ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin.

On the world scene there is, of course, the problem of China, and there are many who argue that to hold a world conference without China is merely to emphasise the disunity in the ranks of the world Communist movement, to alienate further the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party rather than to promote a rapprochement. Our Party's views on the policies of the Maoist clique are well known. We continue to believe that to the extent that the present Chinese leadership aligns itself with the forces of imperialism and anti-Sovietism, pitting itself against the entire international Communist movement, it is promoting the objective interests of anti-Communism, however much it may proclaim itself to be the true heir to the communist tradition.

We are also satisfied that the present Chinese Communist leadership is not serving the best interests of the Chinese people, or the cause of peace and social progress, but we remain optimistic that the forces of genuine proletarian internationalism will reassert themselves within the ranks of the Chinese Communist Party.

However, the task of convening a world meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties should not be suspended until that time comes. To do so would be to abandon one of the sacred responsibilities of Communists everywhere to consolidate and strengthen the world anti-imperialist front of the socialist countries and the working class and national liberation movements, and to mobilise the international forces of socialism on those issues they share in common.

True liberation needs a strong working class

Message to the workers from the South African Communist Party.

Workers! Comrades!

The South African Communist Party speaks to you at this historic moment in the history of our fight for freedom. Your role in the coming struggles is the key to the future of our country. Your muscle power has built our country's riches. It is your combined strength which can crush racism and return the wealth of our land to all the people. It is within your power to build a life in which man is no longer exploited by man, a life of real brotherhood in which the tyranny of racism and of economic exploitation is ended once and for all. You and your brothers on the land are the overwhelming majority of the people and have the future in your hands. Now, more than ever, there is a chance to go forward.

Freedom Forces Grow Stronger

There have been big changes in the situation. Internationally, the socialist world and its most advanced sector, the Soviet Union, grows in strength. In our own country and in southern Africa, racism, imperialism and foreign domination have suffered important reverses. Vorster's

friend and ally – the fascist dictator of Portugal – was smashed by the courage and determination of our brothers in Mozambique, Angola and Guinea-Bissau who now rule their own countries.

In Angola itself the attempts by Vorster to prevent people's rule by sending in his white army to help some black collaborators like Savimbi and Roberto ended in a full-speed retreat. Under the leadership of the MPLA, the arrogant racists were chased right out of Angola. It is clear for all to see in southern Africa that – like Vietnam – a united people can crush racism and foreign domination. The challenge to what remains of minority domination on our continent grows stronger with each passing day. In Namibia and Zimbabwe the enemy is under increasing attack. The time cannot be far off when the people of these countries will be free of minority dictatorship and foreign occupation.

In South Africa Vorster knows that the day is fast approaching when his armed thugs will be answered in the only language they understand – the language of the people's armed force. He has seen the writing on the wall, not only in the humiliating defeats in Angola, but also in the growing militancy of South Africa's oppressed in every corner of the land. The workers have shown their strength by acting together in the factories and on the mines to win their demands. The youth have not been silenced by the terror and continue to raise their voices louder against white oppression. In the country areas anger is mounting against the poverty, land hunger and exploitation of the racist administration and its collaborators.

Above all the struggle for the crushing of minority rule is taking place in a situation more favourable than ever before to the liberation forces. South Africa's borders are no longer surrounded by the friends of white rule. And the enemy no longer has a monopoly of force. Thanks to the principled internationalism of socialist countries such as the Soviet Union and Cuba, the liberation forces can now meet the enemy with the same weaponry and skills which he has always kept from us in order to make us believe in his "invincibility" and "superiority."

Unity Is The Key

If we are united, no force on earth can prevent our victory. That is why the racists are working harder than ever to divide us amongst ourselves, trying desperately to make us think and act, not as workers or as Africans, but as Zulus, Xhosas, Sothos, Tswana and so on. They want us to believe that our land is not South Africa, but just the Bantustan backyards. We are continuously told that our leaders are not the heroes

like Sisulu, Mbeki, Mandela, Kotane, but those on the government payroll like the Matanzima's. The racists work unendingly to break the unity of the Africans with their oppressed black brothers, the Coloured and Indian people. They know that it is too late to prevent us organising trade unions, so they try to sell us the fraud of boss and government-controlled factory committees. They give concessions to Indian traders to exploit more easily the mass of the Indian working people. They try to tempt the Coloured people with sham Councils in place of real democracy which cannot come until all blacks are free. They give minor concessions to the handful of African traders and businessmen in the hope that they will act on the side of the white man's "law and order." Big salaries and American cars are given to the few who will help the ruling class run the Bantustan labour colonies. In the meanwhile the poverty of the mass of the people grows and the gap between white and black incomes widens by the day. The black oppressed are fed on the nonsense of tribal division and Bantu education and asked to accept the lie that most of South Africa and its riches are the "natural" property of the white minority.

The working class of our country will not be misled by these new attempts by our oppressors to use the collaborators amongst the black people to do their dirty work. The time is also long past when we accept anything less than our full rights as a people and as an exploited class. We know that it is our labour which has built up the riches of South Africa; it is our sweat and toil and our lives which have been used to dig out the gold and to develop the rich farmlands. We claim every mine, every factory and every farm in South Africa for the people. We have suffered race oppression because we were needed as cheap labour for the big settler farmers and the capitalist bosses. Therefore to end the barbarism of white domination, we must destroy its foundations – the capitalist system. But the immediate task facing the workers and all our oppressed people is the destruction of minority domination. That is why the workers unconditionally support and engage in the struggle for national liberation headed by the African National Congress.

Workers Must Lead

In the coming struggles for power, the working class has a special role to play. In alliance with the working people and poor peasants in the countryside, we are the most uncompromising enemy of race and class oppression and the most powerful force for true national liberation. As workers we gain nothing but misery from the Bantustans which are

being used as an excuse to deprive us of all rights and to hound us like dogs in the cities we have built with our labour. Every single inch of South Africa belongs to the people. We have nothing to gain from the kind of liberation which gives a few black businessmen the right to share in our exploitation. When workers talk of liberation, they mean the destruction of all exploiters – white and black.

The struggles which we have carried out in the last few years in the factories and on the mines have given us new confidence in our organised strength. We must use this strength to press home the demand for the right to strike and the right to free trade union organisation. Workers are not fooled by the government's new laws which pretend to give them the right to strike. We refuse to be cheated by the Bantu Works Committees which serve the bosses and are used to try to stop real African trade unionism. We stand on our guard against the attempts by the white trade union movement to control the growth of black workers' organisation. We are no longer prepared to be dominated by those who collaborate with the ruling class to ensure the maximum exploitation of the blacks.

We believe in the true unity of all workers – Africans, Indians, Coloureds and Whites. But there must be real equality and majority control. Only when the white workers stop collaborating with our class enemies and act as part of a united working class, will we welcome them as brothers. They must stop using racialism to get special privileges. They must not expect the black workers to take a second class part in white-controlled and white-led trade union centres. **Our Party and the national liberation movement has always supported the South African Congress of Trade Unions (SACTU) as the only genuine democratic and non-racial trade union movement. SACTU has, in the last 20 years, continued to give trade union guidance and leadership to workers throughout our country under conditions of persecution and terror. SACTU is an important part of the liberation alliance.**

In South Africa the struggle of the black workers cannot be separated from their struggle against national oppression. For the black working class – as part of the oppressed and exploited majority, there is only one way out: the complete destruction of white supremacy and the creation of a People's Government dedicated to placing South Africa along the road to socialism.

Forward To Freedom and Socialism

We must use all our power and strength to support and fight for the im-

mediate aims of the National Liberation Front headed by the African National Congress. We must combine armed struggle with mass political resistance. We must reject the few amongst the black people, especially in the Bantustans, who collaborate with the enemy. We must learn to recognise those who pretend to be good "black nationalists" but who really just want to share with the white capitalist class in the exploitation of the black working people in the towns, on the farms and in the Bantustans. **True national liberation needs a strong working class which has a special role to play in the alliance of patriotic forces against the minority dictatorship. That is why we need a strong Communist Party and a well-organised trade union movement which form part of the liberation alliance headed by the African National Congress. In our country the national struggle cannot be separated from the class struggle.**

Workers! Comrades!

– We are the backbone of the struggle for national liberation.

– It is only our collective strength which will ensure that the mass of the people will benefit from liberation and not just the few who want to step into the shoes of the white exploiters.

– It is your vigilance in the revolution which will help to put an end to economic exploitation which is the foundation of racism.

– It is under our leadership that our country will move towards a socialist society in which all the factories, mines and farms are owned by the people and are run in the interests of all our people.

– It is our readiness to organise, to resist and to fight back against the racist dictatorship which will determine how quickly our people win the immediate aims of the National Liberation Movement headed by the African National Congress.

INTENSIFY the struggle for higher wages and better conditions! Build strong black trade unions! Organise secret committees of the most reliable workers to lead the struggle in the factories! Support and strengthen your political organisation – the South African Communist Party!

STUDY the liberating ideas of Marxism and Leninism and fight

against anti-Sovietism and anti-Communism – the weapons of the enemy!

SUPPORT and strengthen the African National Congress and its allies in the National Liberation Front!

FORWARD TO FREEDOM!
END EXPLOITATION OF MAN BY MAN!
FORWARD TO A REAL PEOPLE'S SOUTH AFRICA!
THE TIME IS NOW TO DESTROY WHITE DOMINATION!
AMANDLA NGAWETHU!
MATLA KE A RONA!

The "New" U.S. Policy in Africa

by William Pomeroy

An important feature of the developing liberation struggle in southern Africa has been the increasing interventionist role played by the United States. As neither Western European imperialism nor the racist European ruling minority in southern Africa exhibit the capacity to withstand the advance of black revolutionary forces for change, U.S. imperialism has stepped in to a greater extent than previously to try to block or to divert the liberation process.

Since mid-1975 two major moves have been made by US. imperialism in Africa. The first of these involved military intervention in Angola, where from July to December, 1975, $32 million worth of arms and equipment were channeled by the CIA to its counter-revolutionary clients, the FNLA and UNITA, including over half a million dollars for the recruitment of white mercenaries in Britain alone. This move ended in failure.

The second move, which is linked with the failure of military intervention in Angola, has been the descent upon Africa during the first half of 1976 by U.S. Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger, U.S. Under Secretary of State, William Schaufele, U.S. Defence Secretary, Donald

Rumsfeld and a number of other top U.S. officials, with the much-publicised aim of putting into effect a "new, integrated" U.S. policy for Africa. Announced as a turn-about in U.S. policy, it purports to accept the principles of self-determination and majority rule for "all the peoples of southern Africa."

It is important to analyse these moves for an understanding of imperialist strategy and tactics in Africa today.

Having never been a colony-owning power in Africa, U.S. imperialism has had a relatively lower profile on the continent than that of British, French, Portuguese, Belgian or other imperialist systems. To the present time, expressed in terms of investment and trade, U.S. interests have held a relatively subordinate position to that of its main Western European rivals. However, although Africa has sometimes been described, in statements for public consumption, as not being an area of prime U.S. concern, it has in the past two decades become an area of major concentration by U.S. imperialism, which has become the holder of the fastest-growing economic stake in Africa.

From 1957 to 1970 private U.S. investments in the whole of Africa increased five times over, from $664 million to $3,476 million. Official aid and loans would increase this sum by at least a third. The significant aspect of these, and of the time period in which they occurred, is that U.S. imperialism benefitted from decolonisation in Africa, moving into the former colonies of its Western European rivals when their formal systems of control were overthrown, dissolved or relaxed.

A Bureau of African Affairs, in fact, was not created in the U.S. State Department until 1958. This was after the independence of Ghana in 1957 signalled the beginning of the end of the European colonial system in Africa, and it anticipated the "winds of change" pronouncement by Harold MacMillan that came a year and a half later. By the time of the imperialist in-fighting that took place for the control of the independent Congo in 1960-1964, the U.S. had the diplomatic and corporate machinery on the ground to make a major neo-colonial penetration in that country, now called Zaire.

It should be noted that U.S. intrigue and intervention in Angola bore more than one resemblance to the Congo operation, U.S. imperialism making an obvious bid to replace withdrawing Portuguese imperialism by attempting to place in power its chosen puppet grouping beholden to U.S. financing and to the automatic weapons of mercenaries paid by the U.S.

Strategic Minerals

By the outset of the 1970's, U.S. imperialism began to display an increasing concern with southern Africa and with the development of liberation struggles in that region. Basically, this had to do with long-range U.S. worry over cheap access to rare minerals, especially lithium, uranium, beryllium, chrome and others that are important to future technology now in the planning stages (lithium, for example, is essential for high-power batteries intended for use in electrically-driven cars in a coming age of oil shortage). Southern Africa contains some of the principal deposits in the world of all these minerals.

During 1969 Henry Kissinger, as Secretary of State in the new Nixon administration, drew up policy documents regarding Africa. One of these, "The U.S. and Africa in the 70's", was issued publicly in March, 1970. It was a low-key statement that called for any process of change in southern Africa to be peaceful (i.e., it opposed armed struggles for liberation), that gave customary lip-service opposition to apartheid to hide the increased U.S. flow of investment to South Africa, and that praised in contrast "the declared Portuguese policy of racial toleration" that "holds genuine hope for the future."

At the same time, Secretary Kissinger prepared a private memorandum that set forth actual policy, embodying advocacy of support for racist regimes in southern Africa. Leaked in 1974, it gained itself the name of the "Tar Baby paper" because of its derogatory terminology about black African states and movements. It called for stronger U.S. links and investment ties with South Africa, confidently estimated that Portugal would contain liberation struggles and win its colonial wars, rejected support for demands for majority rule, called for the strengthening of military and economic ties with Mobutu's Zaire and urged "selective relaxation" of sanctions against Rhodesia and other forms of opposition to racist regimes.

As an implementation of the latter recommendation, the Nixon administration in September, 1970 (through the vehicle of the Byrd Amendment), breached the United Nations sanctions against Rhodesia by authorising the importation of Rhodesian chrome ore by the U.S. Foote Minerals and Union Carbide companies. (The deliberate aid to the Smith regime that this move involved is made plain in a statement in May, 1976, by U.S. Senator Charles Percy, that, although the excuse for the Byrd Amendment was that the U.S. should escape dependence on imports of chrome from the Soviet Union, imports of Soviet chrome

actually increased after the passage of the Byrd Amendment and Rhodesian chrome has not totalled more than 5 per cent of U.S. imports of the ore since 1970.) The Nixon administration, further implementing the Kissinger memo, encouraged the rapid growth of U.S. private investment in South Africa, which jumped from $864 million in 1970 to approximately $1,400 million by the end of 1973. It also gave support to Portugal's colonial wars through both NATO agencies and U.S. direct assistance, including aid to Holden Roberto's FNLA, based in Zaire, in order to split and disrupt the Angolan liberation struggle.

In other words, the initial U.S. imperialist policy in Africa identified with Kissinger was based on an estimate that southern Africa – including Mozambique, Angola, Rhodesia, Namibia and South Africa – could be held for imperialism indefinitely, and that liberation forces were not strong enough or effective enough to win their struggles or prevent imperialist exploitation of the region.

Portugal's Collapse

The collapse of the Portuguese colonial empire in Africa and the coming to power of revolutionary liberation movements committed to socialist programmes of development in all of its former colonies was a grave blow to U.S. imperialist policy-makers, who were further alarmed by the impetus this gave to liberation forces in the rest of southern Africa. Most serious in the Portuguese defeat was the loss to imperialism of Angola with its largely untapped mineral wealth. U.S. imperialism therefore made an effort through its already-established network of neo-colonial allies – Zaire, South Africa, the FNLA, UNITA – to thwart a genuine independence for Angola.

This U.S. imperialist bid to check and control the liberation trend was not a new policy but was a continuation and intensification of the existing Kissinger line in Africa. An attempt was made to screen the intervention by claiming that it was a response to assistance by the Soviet Union and Cuba to the MPLA government of genuine independence, but in true order of events, the U.S. military move came first.

(It is essential not to be taken in by the propaganda depiction of U.S. policy in Africa as merely following "superpower" global rivalries. U.S. policy, including the formulations devised by Kissinger, is based on hard-headed economic and political calculations of African circumstances themselves. Its choice of areas to defend or in which to put a military or financial presence has far more to do with African resources and social forces than with the aid policies of socialist countries.)

That U.S. imperialist intervention in Angola was defeated was due to two main factors:

1. An underestimation of the strength of liberation forces in southern Africa by U.S. imperialism and its allies. While the outcome of the struggle in Angola was certainly shaped to a considerable extent by the relative measures of socialist and imperialist aid to the contending sides, the greater consideration was the effective organisation and mass following of the MPLA that had been built up for over a decade within Angola and that was underestimated by U.S. imperialism.

This underestimation extended as well to U.S. appreciation of trends in Africa as a whole. An illustration of this was the outcome of the U.S. effort in January, 1976, to influence the attitude of member states of the Organisation of African Unity toward the Angolan situation. In advance of the OAU summit meeting in Addis Ababa in that month, Secretary Kissinger dispatched his Under Secretary of State for African Affairs, William Schaufele, on a tour of "pro-Western" capitals in Africa to whip up support for a "coalition" government of the MPLA-FNLA-UNITA, and for an OAU resolution that would include opposition to Soviet and Cuban aid for the MPLA government as well as to South African aggression. The appearance of stalemate in the 22 to 22 vote on the question of the Angolan government, while confirming ideological differnces in the OAU, was scant satisfaction for the U.S.: within a matter of days, the "coalition" issue was buried under the parade of OAU members to recognise the MPLA government.

A further display of inaccurate assessment by U.S. policy-makers of African temper came during the subsequent tour of selected African countries by Kissinger in April. Two of the key countries on his list – Nigeria and Ghana – refused to receive the U.S. emissary, the reason being the clear identification of U.S. imperialism with the South African invasion of Angola.

2. A second reason for the U.S. defeat was opposition in the United States itself to intervention in Africa. In the aftermath of the Vietnam war, a general revulsion against any military involvement abroad, whether overt or covert, exists now among the American people, but in the case of Africa, the large U.S. black minority is a special powerful factor when it comes to intervention against a black people. A caucus of black U.S. congressmen has long been vocal against apartheid and white minority regimes in southern Africa, and an anti-apartheid, pro-liberation sentiment has been growing. During the Angola intervention period, an attempt by the conservative-controlled Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) to encourage mercenary recruitment for FNLA-

UNITA failed to win a response. Undoubtedly, open intervention by U.S. forces in Africa would produce a major protest movement within the U.S.

There are sharp divisions in U.S. ruling circles themselves on African policy. The U.S. Senate overrode the Kissinger line of backing FNLA-UNITA and voted by a large margin to halt military aid to these groups, overt or covert. When presidential candidate, Ronald Reagan, proposed to commit U.S. ground forces to a "peacekeeping role" in Rhodesia, the protest quickly compelled him to back down and to pledge that "U.S. troops would never fight on African soil." Senator Dick Clark, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, called for a "new U.S. policy in Africa" that would "recognise that the course of history is on the side of those struggling against racial domination." Even the right-wing Senator Henry Jackson warned that the U.S. should not become aligned with white minority regimes in southern Africa.

New Policies

Post-Angola U.S. imperialist policy contains some hasty patchwork to take account of these factors and reveals some significant shifts from the Kissinger memoranda of 1970. There is recognition that the whole strategy of maintaining a white minority bulwark for imperialism in southern Africa has crumbled, that the Portuguese sector of this has been unalterably swept aside, that the Rhodesian sector cannot be expected to last for long in the face of mounting armed liberation struggle and that the apartheid state of South Africa itself is in danger unless its rigid system is modified.

As shown in the Kissinger speech in Lusaka in April, 1976, the first step has been to appease liberation sentiment by throwing up a smokescreen of publicly-expressed support for "majority rule" and for "the great goals of national independence, economic development and racial justice." Visible behind the smokescreen, however, lie the unchanged U.S. aims of thwarting armed and other non-peaceful struggles for liberation by revolutionary movements, now seen as possible through fostering a "negotiating" process that would bring "moderate" black leaders to the forefront and that would enable the maximum retention of holdings and opportunities by imperialist interests.

Three elements in the "new, integrated" U.S. policy in Africa require attention:

1. **A Rhodesian Settlement.** This was the focal point of concern in the Kissinger visit to Africa in April, 1976, being the most vulnerable

area of the imperialist position after Angola. Much journeying about of special envoys between Salisbury, London and Washington, to attain a U S.-British understanding and a measure of the price demanded by the U.S. for its role, preceded the trip by Kissinger, whose proposals showed a desire to oust the embarrassing ultra-right Smith regime on the one hand and to isolate the armed liberation forces on the other, in order to produce an imperialist concept of a negotiated settlement.

This would hinge on a proposal for the U.S. to finance the buying out of the Rhodesian white settler farmers in a scheme following the lines of the independence settlement in Kenya, which has obviously been in the forefront of U.S. and British thinking. Kenya has been held up as the model decolonisation arrangement in Africa: a buying out of white landholdings by Britain and their transferrence to African private ownership, and a retention of the foreign stake in industry, trade and finance, helping to erect a thoroughgoing capitalist state in partnership with an encouraged ambitious African bourgeoisie.

Britain lacks the means today to carry out a similar transaction in Rhodesia, which would be a more costly operation than in Kenya, but the U.S. seems to have indicated that it is prepared to do so. Obviously, with U.S. interests able to call the tune, the price of this could only be an intensification of U.S. multinational and financial penetration in Rhodesia, replacing or dominating British interests. In the U.S. view, "majority rule" in Rhodesia under "moderate" black leaders would be like "Africanisation" in Kenya, with U.S. imperialism the beneficiary.

In such a move, U.S. imperialism would be playing its by now standard game in Africa of taking advantage of the crumbling of other empires to move in and take over or reassemble the pieces.

2. **Military Intervention.** Despite the halting of U.S. military aid to the puppet FNLA-UNITA in Angola, the U.S., far from ceasing military intervention in Africa, is moving to intensify it. The call for "peaceful change" is contradicted by a stepping up of arms aid to every possible ally.

This was displayed in the visit to Africa, on the heels of the Kissinger tour, by U.S. Defence Secretary, Donald Rumsfeld, in June, 1976. Rumsfeld negotiated the sale of 12 Northrop F-5 advanced jet fighter planes to Kenya for $75 million. A number of ominous aspects are attached to this agreement. It commits capitalist Kenya for the first time to a build-up toward military power in a corner of Africa where social change (in Somalia, Ethiopia) is developing. It involves, too, the further replacing of weakening Britain by the more aggressive U.S. imperialism.

For U.S. policy-makers, the new relationship with Kenya, in addition, is part and parcel of the U.S. military penetration of the Indian Ocean and of the grand NATO strategy of linking an extended Atlantic-Indian Ocean presence connected by agreements with South Africa; a strategic tie-up is effected between the new U.S. naval-air base on Diego Garcia island and the African mainland. U.S. naval and air visits since the Rumsfeld trip to Kenya indicate an understanding for U.S. use of Kenya base facilities.

Even more ominous has been the involvement of Kenya subsequently in the aggressive raid on Entebbe, Uganda, by Israeli commandos, utilising a plane-hijacking episode that itself was surrounded by mysterious circumstances. There are evidences of an extensive tie-up between the Israeli armed forces and NATO agencies, besides Kenya, in that operation, which demonstrated the vulnerability of independent African states to attack and the capability for intervention from long range to be carried out. The OAU correctly pointed to the Israeli-South African military link as underlying the Israeli move, which the OAU condemned.

The Rumsfeld military mission had another destination: Zaire, where the Mobutu regime has been a client of U.S. military aid from its inception. Rumsfeld reportedly discussed the provision of sophisticated tanks and anti-tank guns to this neighbour of Angola which had given aid and shelter to the FNLA and had joined with it in intervention against the MPLA. U.S. government spokesmen said in regard to the Rumsfeld trip that in 1975-1976, Zaire would have received as much military aid as it had received in the past 15 years.

As the suppressive white minority regimes in southern Africa have become less viable, therefore U.S. imperialism is expanding military ties with conservative black neo-colonial states. At the same time, the U.S. and other NATO members have done nothing to stop the recruitment of mercenaries from among their nationals and they continue covert assistance to counterrevolutionary armed groups, with Secretary Kissinger pledging military aid to unnamed forces to oppose liberation movements that receive aid from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

3. **Growing Ties Between the U.S. and South Africa.** While a rapid increase of private U.S. investments in South Africa has been going on, officially and publicly, especially in the United Nations, the U.S. government has been compelled to express disapproval of apartheid and to keep relations with South Africa low-key. In the aftermath of the Angolan liberation, however, U.S. imperialism has moved quickly to

rescue South Africa from the growing isolation and condemnation brought upon it by its aggression in Angola and then by its massacre of blacks, including children in Soweto and other townships.

U.S. imperialism has come out openly with a massive cosmetic operation to bestow "diplomatic respectability" upon the apartheid regime. Disregarding the risks of world opinion, Kissinger met with Premier Vorster in West Germany in June, with the promise of further such meetings, including a prospective summit meeting between Vorster and the U.S. President. Under U.S. sponsorship, it is hoped, South Africa's "detente" with independent black African states can be revived. A prime aim of Kissinger in this process has been to involve the Vorster government in a negotiated settlement in Rhodesia. John Blake, the No. 2 man in the Bureau of African Affairs of the U.S. State Department, told the Senate African Subcommittee that "the U.S. is planning closer relations with South Africa to bring about change in southern Africa as a whole." As another U.S. State Department source put it, the hope is to "give South Africa a better image through helping to get rid of Smith."

Change in South Africa itself, however, is couched in the vaguest of terms by all U.S. spokesmen. In his Lusaka speech, Secretary of State Kissinger did not even mention the word *apartheid* in speaking of South Africa, nor did he specifically refer to majority rule for South Africa. He said: "Our policy toward South Africa is based on the premise that *within a reasonable time* we shall see a clear *evolution towards* equality of opportunity and basic human rights for all South Africans." (my italics.) This policy amounts to little more than the buying of time for the Vorster regime which could remain in power indefinitely with slight modifications and concessions in the existing system that could be claimed as "evolution."

In its new open relationship with South Africa, the U.S. puts itself in a position to claim credit for any "reform" in apartheid, howsoever slight, to facilitate thereby both its public lending and private investment in South Africa. The policy is aimed not only at appeasing anti-apartheid sentiment in Africa but also in the U.S., where it has in early 1976 caused the rejection of U.S. Export-Import Bank financing of U.S. investments and the frustration of the $1 billion bid by U.S. companies to build two nuclear plants in South Africa.

In sum, U.S. imperialism has decided to play an increasing role in Africa as a whole and in southern Africa in particular. Liberation forces, both in independent governments and in movements fighting for freedom, need to be on their guard against a powerful, ruthless and

devious enemy, skilled at utilising others to carry out its dominance. However, the "new, integrated policy" of U.S. imperialism in Africa is essentially a policy of retreat to new lines of entrenchment. It is the liberation forces that have compelled this, and it is the liberation forces that will end all imperialist intervention in Africa.

Be informed by keeping in tune with –

RADIO MOSCOW'S AFRICAN SERVICE.

Keeps you up to date on:

Life and developments in the USSR, the Soviet people's solidarity with the courageous struggle of the peoples of Southern Africa against apartheid and racial discrimination, for national and social liberation.

Africa can hear Radio Moscow 23 hours a day in 14 languages.

For Southern Africa		Time GMT	WAVELENGTH
Listen to us	in English:	18.30-19.00	19,25,31,49 m.
		15.00-15.30	13,16,19,25,31m.
	in Zulu:	17.30-18.00	16,19,25m.
	in Shona and Ndebele:	15.30-16.30	13,16,19,25m.

Important: Please note that our frequencies are changed in May and October. The details are announced at the end of our programmes.

Address: African Service, Radio Moscow, Moscow, USSR

S.A. Imperialism – 1976 Balance sheet

by Phineas Malinga

Professor G.M.E. Leistner is the deputy director of the Africa Institute in Pretoria and, as such, one of the leading theorists of South African imperialism. In 1972 he wrote a pamphlet* in which he set out to prove that South Africa was doing as much as any Western country in providing "aid" to developing countries. In order to do so, he took up a position reminiscent of the earliest phase of Western neo-colonialism – a position which would nowadays be considered defensible only by the most primitive right-wingers in America or Western Europe.

South Africa, he wrote, "shows little interest in issues such as the percentage of gross domestic product to be devoted to 'aid' . . . . Development aid in the South African context is not primarily the financial flows shown in OECD and UN statistics. Far more important is the fact that a dynamic and broadly based industrial economy has been created in South Africa, and is fast transforming the peoples and the environment of Southern Africa . . . . The functioning of South Africa's modern economy promotes and helps to sustain development in neighbouring countries through ordinary commercial relations such as pri-

**Co-operation for Development in Southern Africa* by G.M.E. Leistner, Africa Institute, Pretoria, 1972.

vate investment, tourism, trade, labour movements and the sharing of technical know-how "

In other words, South Africa sees (or at any rate saw in 1972, when her self-confidence was at a very high level) no need to lure victims into the neo-colonialist trap with lavish grants of government money. Her neighbours were expected to be grateful for being allowed to occupy the classic position of nineteenth century colonies. They were to be the suppliers of raw materials, labour and tourist entertainment to their superior neighbour. They were to submit to the "transformation" of their economies which would result from this status if laissez-faire policies were allowed to take their course.

Professor Leistner's pamphlet went on to describe in detail some of the alleged benefits which this form of "aid" was conferring upon South Africa's neighbours. The majority of his examples came, not unexpectedly, from that inner ring of states – Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland, Rhodesia and Malawi – which have been largely integrated into an imperialist system based on South African hegemony.

Since the relationship with these states is held out by the South Africans themselves as a model to be followed throughout a wide region of Africa, it is instructive to examine that relationship in some detail.

Currency Bond

The first bond by which these states are bound to South Africa is that of currency. Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland have a full monetary union with South Africa, which deprives them of all control of their currency. When the rand was devalued last year, they were informed twenty four hours in advance of the public announcement but were not consulted. All that they could do was to note the fact that their imports from countries other than South Africa were now going to cost one-sixth more than had been the case the day before. Rhodesia's currency is theoretically separate from South Africa's, but has no real independence. The decision of the South African Reserve Bank, a few days after UDI, to continue to accept Rhodesian currency as convertible in unlimited amounts, was the first tangible sign of South African support for UDI and has remained crucial to the survival of the Smith regime ever since. The international value of Rhodesian money is determined entirely by the rate at which the South African Reserve Bank is willing to purchase it.

The second bond which ties Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland is the customs union. This means, firstly, that these countries cannot use tariffs as a means of regulating their trade with South Africa. Secondly

it means that customs revenue derived from their trade with the rest of the world is levied at rates fixed by South Africa, collected by the South African customs service and passed on by the South African government to the governments of the three smaller countries. It follows that this revenue could be withheld by South Africa in the event of any serious dispute. The amounts involved were increased, by a typical piece of South African "generosity", in 1969 and are now very substantial. The receipts of the other three from the South African customs service were R49 million in 1973-4 and R66 million in 1974-5. When this figure is set against a combined gross domestic product of less than R500 million, it is seen that the control which this arrangement gives to South Africa is formidable indeed.

Next must be considered the degrading bond of migrant labour. Not only do the wages of migrant workers in South Africa constitute an important factor in the economies of Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland and Malawi, but here again arrangements have been carefully made to tie the government establishments of these countries into the system. Sixty per cent of the wages of Basotho mineworkers are withheld from the workers while they are in South Africa. The money is paid to the Bank of Lesotho, for onward transmission to the workers after their return home. In the meantime, it constitutes an important part of the currency reserves of the Lesotho government and gives South Africa yet another means of holding that government to ransom. Similar arrangements exist with Malawi. Malawian workers in South Africa are even taxed by the Malawi government through the agency of South African employers.

The holding of key posts in the other countries by South Africans is another method by which control is exercised. The fact that Lesotho's industrial development shows no sign of terminating Lesotho's status as a reservoir of cheap labour for South Africa is hardly surprising when one considers that the first head of the Lesotho National Development Corporation was a Mr Wynand van Graan, who came to the service of the Lesotho government from that of the Rembrandt Group.

So far as the Smith regime is concerned, South Africa's hold is reinforced by other factors too well known to be repeated in detail here. The position can be summarised by saying that the Smith regime exists by courtesy of the South African ruling class.

Portuguese Colonies

In the early years of this decade, it appeared that there were two territories outside the inner ring of South African satellites, whose status

was being steadily brought nearer to that of the inner ring. These were Mozambique and Angola. South African investment in both territories had increased steadily through the sixties. Migrant labour arrangements similar to those with Lesotho and Malawi were made with the colonial regime in Mozambique. The Cabora Bassa and Cunene dam schemes were designed, firstly, to supply South Africa with cheap power, secondly to provide markets for South African machinery and expertise and thirdly, to implant in the economies of Mozambique and Angola important elements which would be subject to South African influence and control.

With five states dominated and another two moving in the direction of domination, it was no wonder that South Africa looked with some confidence for potential victims further north, while African governments which had been infiltrated by imperialism began to consider whether the logic of their situation did not demand the acceptance of relations with South Africa. This was the basic reality behind the policy of "dialogue" between South Africa and a number of reactionary African states.

The liberation of Mozambique and Angola has completely changed the situation. It has reversed the trend. It has forced South African imperialism from the offensive on to the defensive. Instead of looking forward to the prospect of strengthening their hold on two additional satellites, the South Africans now have to face the immediate danger of losing vital sectors of their inner ring. It is not surprising that a military adventure should have been undertaken to avert this misfortune. The failure of the adventure, however, has multiplied the misfortune. The retreat of the South African army from Angola has dramatised for the world to see – with incalculable effects on the morale of both sides in the struggle – the turning of the imperialist tide.

It would nevertheless be a grave error to assume that the struggle is over, that from now on events are going to move smoothly in one direction, or that the threat of South African imperialism to freedom in the rest of Africa has disappeared. On the contrary, there is a new threat which can clearly be identified at the present moment. It arises from the relationship between South Africa and Zaire.

Zaire has for many years been (as befits a country under strong influence from US imperialism) notorious for its failure to cut off trade links with South Africa. During 1975, the sharp fall in world copper prices faced Zaire with serious difficulties. South Africa then came to the aid of the Mobutu regime by extending credit terms for South African exports to Zaire, in spite of the fact that there had been

defaults on existing debts. This was the situation at the time of the Angolan war. In that war, Zaire and South Africa were allies in fact, though it did not suit either government to say much about the alliance. The aftermath of the war left Zaire with a new problem in the loss of its trade routes to the sea through Angolan territory. Once again, South Africa came to the rescue. Zairean copper is now exported through Rhodesia and South Africa, while a substantial part of Zaire's petrol supplies and food imports travel the same route in the opposite direction. There is no longer the slightest pretence of a boycott of South African goods in Zaire.

Vorster's attempts to woo the Bokassa regime in the Central African Republic and other French stooges like Senghor and Houphouet-Boigny persist, but they are of peripheral importance. An isolated pocket of collaboration in the middle of West Africa would be no more than an irritation to the liberation struggle and a minor source of income to the imperialists. Zaire, on the other hand, could be of crucial importance, not only because of its own size, wealth and military strength but also because of the danger that as a result of outside pressures Zaire's fate could be linked with Zambia's.

Zambia's economic problems are severe, its trade and communications links with the south not unimportant and imperialism has dangerous economic bases implanted in Zambian territory. The government of Zambia is continually being subjected to enormous pressures, and further South African penetration of Zaire may result in an escalation of these pressures to a point where they interfere with the implementation of Zambia's policies of support for the liberation movements.

Nor is South Africa incapable of direct attempts to de-stabilise the Zambian Government, to the extent of training and financing anti-Kaunda guerrilla factions, and even launching direct attacks on Zambian territory. It is noteworthy that when the UN Security Council last July condemned one such South African attack in which 24 lives were lost, the United States abstained: a clear indication of US complicity with South Africa's imperialist policy in Africa.

Here, then, is the direction of the South African counter-attack. Launched as it may be from a position of political weakness, it is nevertheless backed up by the strength of the continent's most developed economy and the secretive assistance of the imperialists. The utmost vigilance and unity, as well as ideological clarity, are needed to ensure that the outcome is favourable to the oppressed peoples of Southern Africa.

Economy strangled by Colour Bars

by David Davis

The South African ruling class is currently experiencing its most serious politico-economic crisis since Sharpeville sixteen years ago. Together with the advances made by the liberation forces in Rhodesia and Namibia, the rising tide of black militancy within the country (as evidenced by the Soweto demonstrations and the increasing spate of detentions and trials) has forced the regime into a state of permanent military mobilisation. The high cost of these policies, together with that of the regime's defeated Angolan adventure, has placed severe strains on an economy already suffering from the ills of capitalism and racism. Inflation is running at 11.6% per year[1], almost two million blacks go unemployed [2] while 40,000 whites-only jobs remain unfilled [3], and the price of gold (responsible for 45% of all foreign earnings in 1974 [4] has been falling to its lowest levels since December, 1973.

As always, the ruling class has attempted to escape from its crisis at the expense of the workers. One of the objects of the 17.9% devaluation of the rand in September, 1975, was as Comrade Malinga has shown [5], an attempt to preserve the profitability of the gold mining industry (which incurs most of its costs in rands) by increasing the rand

price of gold, and in so doing, cutting the *real value* of the wages paid to the mine workers.

The shortage of skilled white labour which resulted from the economic boom of 1960-74, and the subsequent upward mobility of black workers into certain job categories, has been utilised by the capitalist class for the same ends. In particular, tendencies over the past few years show use of the mechanism of job fragmentation, not merely as a means of overcoming skilled labour shortages, *but as a device for increasing the share of national income accruing to the industrial capitalists and the white working class at the expense of black workers.*

The shortage of skilled labour has been steadily growing to crisis proportions. A report by the Witwatersrand University Education Panel states that the economy will require 3.8 million skilled workers in 1980[6]. Even if every one of the 1,8 million economically-active whites were to be employed in a skilled job, this would still leave a shortfall of around 2 million skilled workers. And, according to the Institute for Manpower Research (IMR) of the Human Sciences Research Council, there will be a total of only 775,000 skilled African, Coloured and Asian workers in 1980[7].

The Department of Labour's "Manpower Surveys,"which include all employees (other than domestics in private sectors and persons engaged in agriculture and farming), give a sharp view of the position. *Manpower Survey No. 10* revealed that, in April, 1973, over 28% of all whites covered by the survey were employed in the two categories Professional, Semi-professional and Technical; and Managerial, Executive and Administrative. *For Africans the figure was 3.56%.* Of this, a mere *.02%* were employed in managerial, executive and administrative positions. *Over 40% of the Africans were classified as labourers, while a further 20% were employed on the mines and quarries.* Whereas there were 222,536 white artisans and apprentices listed, *not a single African artisan or apprentice was to be found,* other than the 12,557 building workers registered under the Bantu Building Workers Act and prohibited from doing skilled building work in urban areas other than in African townships. Managerial, executive and administrative functions were the almost total prerogative of whites. *Whites occupied 96.06% of all jobs* in this category. *For Africans the figure was .48%* [8]. According to the survey there was a shortage of 58,000 white and 7,000 coloured workers, mostly in skilled trades.

Two years later the position had scarcely changed. As *Manpower Survey No. 11* revealed, the proportion of whites employed in the categories Professional, Semi-professional and Technical and Managerial,

Executive and Administrative, had *increased* to 29.57%. For Africans the figure was 4.45%. Of this, only *.14%* were employed in managerial, executive and administrative positions. The survey revealed that the percentage of Africans classified as labourers had decreased *by less than half-a-percent* in the two-year period. *Forty percent of all Africans were still employed as labourers while 15.71% were mine and quarry workers* [9]. If agriculture and private domestic service were to be included within the scope of the surveys, the number and proportions of Africans in the semi and unskilled jobs would be even higher.

While *Survey No. 11* purported to show a change in the position of artisans and apprentices (it listed 6,482 African "artisans and apprentices") the true picture was somewhat different. Of these "artisans and apprentices", over 50% were workers registered under the Bantu Building Workers Act and prohibited by law from working in their trade in white areas, while the remainder were workers trained in the Bantustans and also prevented (by the white craft unions) from using their skills in the urban areas. As the *Financial Mail* confirmed, for apprenticeships "Africans are totally excluded, except in African areas." [10]

Not only Africans. Even "Coloureds and Asians are still excluded from most trades, the main exceptions being in the building, furniture, metal and engineering and printing industries – and usually in the Cape and Natal" [11]. This is confirmed by the *Manpower Surveys:* whites have an almost complete monopoly of skilled trades. In April, 1973, 78.47% of all artisans and apprentices were white, *while in the metal and engineering, electrical and motor trades, the proportion was as high as 95.64%.* For 1975 the figures were 74.12% and 93.18%, respectively [12].

As Comrade Slovo has stated: "White and black workers occupy a distinct and colour-defined position in relation to the means of production. Their respective roles in the social organisation of labour differ, as does the share of the social wealth of which they dispose and the mode of acquiring it" [13]. The surveys confirm this assertion. Out of the total 1,387,000 whites covered by the 1973 *Manpower Survey, over 1,003,000 (72.33%) were engaged in non-productive roles,* either in the tertiary sectors (central government, provincial administrations, finance, professions, wholesale and retail trade, transport, etc.) or in managerial, executive and clerical functions in industry. By 1975 this total had increased still further. Out of the 1,458,000 whites covered by the survey, *more than 1,076,000 (73.81%) were engaged in non-productive roles.* For Africans the proportions were 22.32% in 1973 and 24.51% in 1975 [14].

The declining role of whites, both relatively and absolutely, in the production process, coupled with the bottleneck in production caused by the shortage of skilled white labour, has given rise to two immediate consequences. More and more pressure to remove official restrictions on the employment of Africans in skilled positions and to pressurise white unions to accept the change, has been put on the regime by white industrialists. The unions for their part have been determined to protect their privileged status. Where concessions have been made, this has been in return for job security and generous financial benefits. In the building industry in the Transvaal, for instance, where the government gave its approval to the use of Africans in certain skilled and semi-skilled jobs as from November, 1975, strict controls regulated the ratio of African "operatives" to the number of artisans. Whites in the industry would continue to be given preference and protection, it was stated. [15] Surveys would be taken every three months to ensure there was no white unemployment and a R1-million unemployment fund would guarantee them full pay for 20 years. The jobs opened to Africans included brick and block laying, provided there was to be a plaster covering, certain aspects of carpentry, joinery and drain laying, all plastering except the final trowelling and some tiling.

All told, Africans have up to now been excluded from skilled and semi-skilled jobs in four basic ways:

– **Statutory job reservation,** which applies in relatively few instances, however. There exist 27 job reservation determinations under Section 77 of the Industrial Conciliation Act, (affecting 2.5% of the labour force) [16]. Only 16 of these are currently being enforced. Exemptions have been obtained from some of these, particularly in the building industry (as above).

– **Industrial Agreements.** These agreements between registered unions and employers' assocations often exclude Africans from certain skilled jobs (as in the engineering and the printing and newspaper industries) [17] and make them available *only* to persons eligible to be members of registered trade unions (i.e., whites, coloureds and Asians – but not Africans).

– **Apprenticeship Committees,** composed of whites only, which effectively block Africans from becoming apprentices. As the *Financial Mail* states: "On the face of it, the Apprenticeship Act is colourblind, but the all-white committees are able by one means or another to exclude Africans from apprenticeships." [18]

– **Custom,** where certain jobs are seen to be "white." Although no legal sanction is involved (despite the fact that "the law" is often cited

as the prohibiting factor) blacks are excluded from them as effectively as if job reservation applied.

At least three sets of mechanism have been devised to filter Africans into jobs formerly closed to them, without undermining the status of white workers. All three rest on the principle of cutting costs and paying Africans less for work that would otherwise be done by whites. The first method is simply to promote a white man and hire an African to do his job, usually changing the job's name in the process. The second consists of the "dilution" or "fragmentation" of skilled jobs and the redefinition of work processes in industrial agreements. The third mechanism is the creation of "border areas" near the Bantustans (and cheap black labour) to which industrialists are encouraged to move their plants. [19]

Job fragmentation has been the most typical method by which the colour bar has been moved upwards and the employer's costs moved downwards. A white artisan's job is broken down into several semi-skilled operative jobs. Blacks are then employed as *operatives*, while the white artisan moves up into a supervisory position. Financially, the white benefits by being paid more for less work, while the black operatives are paid less than the white artisan for performing the same work. The employer obtains an increase in production for a smaller total wage bill. At the South African Iron and Steel Corporation (ISCOR), the largest of the country's public corporations, black workers taking over jobs formerly done by whites earned only 50-60% of the previous skilled white worker's wages. As a study of the process at ISCOR confirms, "the principal effects of the re-organisation of the labour process are the increased productivity of black labour to the relative benefit of profits rather than wages." [20]

That this has been generally recognised by employers is shown by the unanimity with which "English" and "Afrikaner" capital have recently condemned the process of job reservation and called for its removal. In the case of ISCOR, for instance, most operative jobs are now in the process of being either regraded or fragmented to be occupied by black workers as quickly as is orderly possible, although always in consultation with the white unions. It was stated that in every wage agreement negotiated with the white trade unions, ISCOR tried to build in 100-150 posts for black operators in exchange for wage increases. [21]

With the worsening of the economic situation the ruling class will find itself more and more compelled to safeguard its profits by undermining the privileged position of the white labour aristocracy. The *Financial Mail* [22], for instance, sees it as a "distinct possibility" that

there will be increasing attempts to lower the national wage structure, as an increasing number of blacks take over jobs previously performed by whites. *Livewire* [23], the official organ of the S.A. Telecommunications Associations, stated that the limited availability of whites in management and the skilled group was "responsible for the excessive salaries offered in some sections." It called for the training and upgrading of (presumably cheap) blacks. Afrikaner capital is of the same opinion. Opening the Industrial Congress of the Afrikaanse Handelsinstituut in May this year, Mr. J. Coetzee, ISCOR managing director, warned that if job reservation was not relaxed soon there would be industrial stagnation. *"Sooner or later the white South African worker will no longer be protected by legislation but only by his degree of training and will to work."* [24]

With the white worker playing a steadily decreasing role in the total economy, and an even smaller one in the *productive* sectors of the economy (7.69% in agriculture [25]; 10.07% in mining and quarrying; 21.90% in manufacturing (*down from 32.71% in 1960*); and 15.35% in construction [26]) the tendencies for the future are clear.

For the black working class, and the African workers in particular, the recession means a period of heightened economic and political struggle. With unemployment heading for its highest level in 30 years according to the Standard Bank [27], every economic struggle must inevitably take on a political form. The migrant labour system, with its mechanics for not only forcing workers into the least desirable jobs, but also forcing down the level of wages and conditions in manufacturing industry, and with the overcrowded, impoverished Bantustans as the lynch pin of this system, will stand more clearly exposed in the near future than at any time in the past.

References

1 Financial Times (London), 22.7.1976.

2 Financial Mail (Johannesburg), 16.7.1976 and Financial Times 23.7.1976.

3 Manpower Survey No. 11 (as at 25.4.1975), Dept. of Labour.

4 Guardian (London), 27.1.1976.

5 *The Golden Key* (Phineas Malinga), African Communist No. 64, page 61.

6 African Training Supplement to the Financial Mail, 29.8.1975, page 9.

7 Cited in African Training Supplement, page 10.

8 All percentages calculated from Manpower Survey No. 10.

9 All percentages calculated from Manpower Survey No. 11.

10 Financial Mail, 21.11.1975.

11 *Ibid.*

12 Figures calculated from Manpower Surveys No. 10 and 11.

13 Southern Africa – The New Politics of Revolution (Davidson, Slovo and Wilkinson), Penguin Books. 1976, page 121.

14 Non-productive functions taken as Categories 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 17 and 27 in 1973 (Manpower Survey No. 10) and as Categories 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 17 and 28 in 1975 (Manpower Survey No. 11). The proportions of Africans engaged in non-productive functions would be significantly reduced if agricultural workers were to be included.

15 Institute of Race Relations Survey 1975, pages 171 and 172.

16 African Training Supplement, page 43 and Race Relations Survey 1975, page 170.

17 South Africa: Workers Under Apartheid (A. Hepple), International Defence and Aid Fund (London), 1971, pages 41 and 45.

18 African Training Supplement, page 45.

19 The South African Connection (First, Steele and Gurney), Penguin Books, page 65.

20 *Labour Policy in ISCOR* (Mike Morris and Dave Kaplan), S.A. Labour Bulletin, Vol. 2, No. 8, page 18.

21 *Labour Policy in ISCOR*, pages 6 and 7.

22 Financial Mail, 23.1.1976.

23 The Star (Johannesburg), 7.2.1976.

24 Cape Times, 19.5.1976.

25 Masters and Serfs (Rosalynde Ainslie), International Defence and Aid Fund (London), 1973, page 7.

26 Figures taken from S.A. Statistics, 1974 and Quarterly Bulletin of Statistics, March, 1976.

27 Rand Daily Mail, 5.5.1976.

A further contribution on the National Question

by Joe Ngwenya

To understand the national question, one must first answer the central question: What constitutes a nation in South Africa? To help in finding an answer, I pose a number of subsidiary questions:

1. What will constitute the nation tomorrow, on independence day, when our nation will be born?
2. What are the component parts of the nation today?
3. What is our approach to the national question – multi-racialism, multi-nationalism or whatever?
4. How do we propose to solve the national question in South Africa?
5. What is the relationship between the national and class struggles in South Africa?
6. What role does ownership of the land, the mines and industry play in our oppression?
7. What is our understanding of tribalism?
8. How do we propose to end the colonial status of our oppressed people and break all the artificial barriers created to divide our people?

In our opinion, **the South African nation is the totality of all its people, black and white, who pay allegiance to South Africa as their homeland.**

This nation which is about to be born, which will come into being on independence day, is still being kept apart in its component parts through the use of the monstrous system of apartheid which is imposed by the powerful racist state machinery. The executive committee of the minority white section has at its disposal the tremendous resources of the country and is backed by world imperialism. The black portion of our population, who provide the real basis for a united South African nation, is objectively interested and is working for the realisation of the nation. The minority component, however, has a vested interest in maintaining the state of apartness of the nation because it enjoys exclusive political power, owns 87% of the land, receives 74% of the national income and enjoys an artificially high standard of living at the expense of the overwhelming majority of the population.

One must not lose sight of the fact that the white minority is able to cling to power thanks to massive imperialist support, because a united, strong and progressive nation is not in the interests of imperialism and super profits. In fact, the white minority has established a special colonialist system differing from the classical model in that the coloniser and the colonised share the same country. The white minority regime, in addition to resorting to violence and force to maintain this obnoxious system, has legalised racism and tribalism in a desperate attempt to divide the people and postpone the day when the people of South Africa will be truly one nation.

Nevertheless, a vast section of the white population is rooted in the country by birth and has no other home and should therefore share a common South African citizenship with all other national groups who live side by side with it. We must regard thewhite ruling class as separate from the white section as a whole. Like Caetano in Portugal, it does not represent the best interests of the whites, although it has temporarily succeeded in imposing its will and ideas on them. There is, however, always a difference between the ruling clique and the white section as a whole, and this is why the ruling clique mortally fears the unity of all the people.

There are other factors which obscure the national question in South Africa. Some of these are historical. The white settlers came to the country when the process of nationhood/nation-formation was reaching a culmination. This was being realised through wars of national formation similar to those characteristic of European countries like Italy,

Germany, France, etc. Shaka was the main exponent of this approach. This is one reason why he is sometimes referred to as the Black Napoleon. Moshoeshoe on the other hand appreciated also the need of a powerful, united nation but saw this in peaceful mergers achieved through persuasion and understanding. He brought into his fold the various scattered groups and formed a powerful unit which became the present Lesotho nation.

The formation of the ANC of South Africa was primarily motivated by the need to unite the people into one single nation. The ANC has never rejected or ignored the existence of the white national group nor for that matter did our forebears. The ANC has struggled for recognition and demanded equal rights and equal participation for all. This is clear from the deputations sent to Europe after the formation of the Union Government by the whites only. Earlier the chiefs had welcomed the white settlers, allotted them land for use (but not ownership) and co-existed with them until the latter broke the conditons of co-existence and therefore provoked the wars that followed. Even then the African wars were never wars of annihilation or subjugation. They were wars of nation formation. The defeated were fully accepted into the community of the victorious and were later not recognisable as separate entities. The original Zulu clan was a tiny unrecognisable minority compared to what became known as the tribe later. Actually, the term "Zulu nation" was meant to mean "the nation under the sky "

What Are the Component Parts of the Nation?

Does the South African nation consist of racial groups or national groups/nationalities? The racist regime is trying to divide the people back into tribes, terming them nations and using their national pride to foster tribalism. It is desperately trying to turn back the historical process of nation-building in the country and has created some nine African "nations." At the same time, it is not trying to divide the white sections into "nations" on the basis of their origin: French, British, Dutch, German, etc. Its inconsistency shows its immorality and the bankruptcy of the disastrous policy it is following. Even the land allocation shows its treachery – 87% for the white section consisting of less than 17% of the population.

We do not support any balkanisation either of the people, country or mineral resources. South Africa is indivisible; its territorial integrity will be defended by our lives. There is only **one South Africa. South**

Africa belongs to all those who live in it. This fact means no separate group can constitute a nation for the simple reason that there is no nation without a country.

The concept of national groups or racial groups in the context of of South Africa is neither contradictory nor exclusive. From 1912 when the ANC was formed, a solid basis was created to bring the various tribes into one solid national group comprising the overwhelming majority of the country, the indigenous people. The white group in 1910 imposed a racialist Union Government and constitution and passed the Land Act in 1913. The ruthless oppression of the Coloureds, removed from the common voters' roll and segregated, and the imposition of the Group Areas Act on the Indians plus other discriminatory laws speeded up the process of the formation of a common national front out of the three racial groups or national groups. Of course, unity was always in the process of being forged from the time when the first political organisations were formed like the APO. The 1946 Xuma-Dadoo pact was an important milestone. Today in South Africa the term "black" has come to mean the Africans, the Coloureds and Indians (people of Indian origin) replacing the infamous term "non-white."

Black unity is being realised in South Africa in the face of intransigence and aggressive racism-apartheid. The component parts of the South African nation consist of differing racial or national groups. We have no intention of over-emphasising the racial origin of the various communities; on the contrary, we reserve the term nation to emphasise the direction in which we are moving. South Africa is one country in which all groups are economically interdependent and integration is taking place in spite of government policy. It is only recognition of the fact that the government is depicting tribalism as a manifestation of the nation that makes us cautious to use the term national group. Many of the national groups – in fact all of them – are dispersed all over the country and intermingled. On the so-called white farms the majority are blacks or Africans. It is also worth noting that when the racist white regime tried to expatriate people of Indian origin, the Africans protested and informed the whites that they are indigenous and the government had no right to expel them.

Multi-racialism

The ANC approach of multi-racialism leading to non-racialism is based on majority rule and the leading role of the African people. This multi-

racialism has nothing in common with the so-called multi-racialism of the Liberal Party, or the National Union of South African Students (NUSAS) which is "multi-racialism" based on minority rule or direction, ignoring the leading role of the African people as the core and the moving spirit of the South African people and NATION. The Africans compose over 70% of the South African working force and nation. They are the most oppressed and exploited section of the population, oppressed and exploited as a national group. All policies followed by South African regimes have been directed towards dispossessing this group, forcing them to have no other means of livelihood except to sell their labour power in the market controlled by whites. In our opinion and as proved by events, the multi-racial approach is correct because it answers to the realities of the South African situation.

The Africans, the overwhelming majority of the South African people, are also the indigenous people of the country. As we have already stated, before the coming of the whites, the process of nation formation was already advanced. We cited Shaka and Moshoeshoe, but in actual fact, the same process was being followed by the other chiefs and tribes. The objective of the ANC to create a nation out of the heterogeneous tribes was in pursuance of the same aims, using all possible methods of political nature but always ready to defend those objectives by force if need be. The very fact that the Africans are the indigenous people who actually allotted land and cattle for use is significant. **It means only they can form the real and genuine basis for the South African nation. It also means that as the most oppressed and exploited section of the population, their interest corresponds to the fundamental interest of South African society. They are the core. But they are not the only group nor the only force though the leading force.** This means all progressives and true lovers of South Africa including all revolutionaries must **see in championing the just cause of the African people the championing of their cause because the solution of the fundamental problems facing the society of South Africa depends on the just solution of the problems facing the African people.** There is the added fact that the Africans as the indigenous people can have no other country to pay allegiance to except South Africa. They are objectively interested in the formation of the true South African nation. Their acceptance of other groups with open arms clearly shows their non-sectarian approach. The South African nation can only be formed on the basis of democratic processes firmly based on majority rule or more correctly the leading role of the majority, in a non-racial society where the skin of a person will have no role.

Some people might think that the concept of majority rule is itself non-democratic and therefore oppressive and unacceptable to the other sections. This is not so. First because non-racialism (non-group democracy if one could say so) can only be brought about by the acceptance of majority rule. The minority rule as we have it now in South Africa cannot work for non-racial democracy, nor for that matter, any sort of democracy. Democracy presupposes majority rule, but in addition, non-racial democracy can only be brought about through majority rule because only the majority can be objectively interested consistently in non-racial democracy and only the majority can be its true basis. The white minority dictatorship rejects unity and democratic formation of a genuine undivided nation. It is doing all this under the name of western civilisation and the preservation of its identity and it defines itself as the bulwark of western interest. . .which is our oppression and suffering. It is keeping an alien face and calls itself European in spite of being born and bred in South Africa. It wants to create a SATO extension of NATO, and is a threat to Africa.

The white dictatorship is in a dilemma. It keeps as prisoners at home those who are real patriots, whilst pretending to advocate the release of political prisoners elsewhere. It wants to deal with nations in neighbouring countries whilst it is trying to divide our people and prevent the formation of a South African nation. Only the African people, given or exercising their right of self-determination and independence, can be the inspirer and basis of the nation.

The main content of the democratic revolution is the liberation of the Africans, and consequently the freeing of other oppressed national groups including the Indians, the Coloureds and even the present oppressor group, the white minority section. **We must bear in mind that the liberation of the African people cannot be brought about without at the same time liberating the whole of the other national sections.** This emanates from the fact that the Africans are the most oppressed and exploited national section. The liberation of the African people will also mean the liberation of South Africa as a country from the chains of European appendage, alien barriers in the continent which prevent it from playing its key role in the affairs of the continent.

Nationalism is the main driving force of the South African revolution, and consequently national liberation is the prerequisite for the further advancement of the revolution. **This clearly means that there can be no democracy, no socialism without at first liberating the Africans, releasing their tremendous energies from the fetters of apartheid. Only the Africans can lead the struggle onward, not alone but**

together, with the other oppressed groups and the democrats and freedom lovers amongst the white section itself. This is an important factor to understand, and it is the key to the understanding of the national question. We must always be aware that nationalism has two faces or sides. There is the progressive side which is the side of the African National Congress of South Africa. We reject the racialist chauvinist or tribalist side as serving the interest of the apartheid regime and internationally, as the events in Angola have shown, as serving international imperialism. The executive committee of the ANCYL, as quoted in Moses Kotane's political biography, has stated:

"The object of African nationalism in a progressive form is to weld all racial groups irrespective of descent and language into a multi-racial unity whose movement in joint resistance can smash the oppressive state machinery that is responsible for the perpetuation of racial disharmony and exclusiveness that dominates the whole fabric of South African society.

"African nationalism does not seek to oppress other racial groups, but rather seeks to express the national aspirations of the indigenous people of this continent and to cultivate a common outlook of unity and peaceful cooperation amongst all ethnic groups living together under equal laws. True African nationalism is not a reaction of disgruntlement for self interest and rejects the idea of racial separateness or racial superiority. It is expressed in the Programme of Action and the Freedom Charter."

The ANC, the undisputed leader of the South African revolution has always striven to mobilise the broadest front in this national struggle. It seriously takes into consideration the grievances of the other national groups in the formulation of the overall revolutionary strategy for the overthrow of the fascist regime and closely works with the other sister organisations. The ANC is aware that although the national character of our struggle must dominate, sight must not be lost of the fact that this struggle is taking place within a continental and world context where the forces for social change have gained the ascendancy and where on the world scale there is definite the transition from capitalism to socialism and where the forces of national liberation are becoming closer and closer to their natural allies, the socialist forces, as shown in Angola and Vietnam. Further progress of the South African revolution will depend on the extent of the success of the national liberation. . . the liberation of the Africans. The Africans cannot liberate themselves without at the same time ensuring the liberation of the whole of South

African society. Therefore, the total mobilisation of the African people, arousing their national pride, down-trodden for over three centuries, deepening national confidence and national assertiveness. This should be broadened so that in it the African should understand not only his being African but more his being South African. This is the surest blow to Bantustanisation. The national struggle is not only to restore African self-respect but more to create South Africanism and the South African nation. We have to bear in mind that the African, like all other sections of the population, must assume full responsibility in creating, deepening and fostering the spirit of South Africanism. The African must be particularly aware of his special responsibility in this role as the representative of the largest section, the most oppressed and exploited, the indigenous and because of his special role in the forthcoming democratic revolution for the establishment of the true South African nation. Nelson Mandela put very clearly the question of the driving force of the South African democratic revolution when he said:

"Our struggle is a truly national one. It is a struggle of the African people inspired by their own suffering."

The same holds good for the Coloureds and the people of Indian origin. In this historical setting of the South African situation, the South African nation will be formalised by victory on victory day.

National and Class Struggle

The African people had to be forcefully and violently subjugated as a national group before being robbed of independent means of subsistence, dispossessed of their land and wealth and forced by economic necessity and laws to seek employment. In other words, they became exploited as a class. Earlier the basis for clashes between the indigenous people and the settlers was disputes over grazing land and stolen cattle. The settlers strove to increase their stock by all means, including foul deceit and bribery, not to mention unequal exchange. With the development of mining and the birth of a market and an infant industry came the new element of increased need for labour by the settlers and mine magnates. The settlers and British colonialism now saw in the defeat of the Africans the unquestionable source of abundant cheap labour. Complete ownership of land and total dispossession became the ultimate aim. Oppression preceded exploitation, but the two were indissolubly linked. That is why **IN THE FINAL ANALYSIS THE SOLUTION OF THE NATIONAL QUESTION MUST CHALLENGE THE VERY EXISTENCE OF CAPITALIST EXPLOITATION AND**

PLACE THE MAJOR MEANS OF PRODUCTION IN THE HANDS OF THE PEOPLE.

It is also clear that although the national struggle dominates, no national struggle will succeed unless it takes due consideration of the capitalist nature of the South African situation. The class struggle is ever visible. One of the main forms of struggle in the country and ANC's sharpest weapon outside the armed struggle is the strike weapon which is a class weapon used in the interest of both the nation and the working class. In South Africa, the whole black people with the exception of a tiny group of Indian merchants and a now-being-groomed African middle class are reduced to the level of working people. This means that the stronger the representation and organisation of the peasants and workers in the national movement, the stronger and more far-reaching will be the nature and character of the national liberation struggle, turning it into a democratic revolution.

It is equally true and necessary that the national liberation struggle must never lose sight of its character and nature and must avoid being sectarian, must mobilise the broadest sections of the population, must strive to win as much as possible of the national forces and objectively progressive elements, must strive to neutralise those forces that it cannot win over and leave the enemy as weak and isolated as possible. The two approaches are not contradictory or antagonistic but are absolutely essential for the successful prosecution of the struggle, both at the political and armed struggle level as was clearly demonstrated in Vietnam, Angola and Mozambique.

The history of racist dictatorship and the oppression of our people disproves theories of consciousness or awareness which maintain that the main struggle should be directed towards the mental decolonisation of our people as a pre-condition for liberation. This theory is false – first becaue it confuses the primacy of matter over consciousness. It also ignores the fact that our people were physically defeated and oppressed before they were forced to swallow the poisonous ideas of colonialism. The negative role of the missionaries should not be overplayed. All our people, the Bushmen, the Koi-koi and then the tribesmen, never feared to face the enemy, actually engaged him for centuries, winning many battles although finally succumbing towards the beginning of the 20th century. Whilst the ideological struggle goes on, there is no question of postponing the day of engaging the enemy. Our physical liberation will create the basis for taking control of the mass media and the education of our people, thereby enabling us to propagate correct ideas of equality and social justice and having our

own teaching system in our own interest. Of course even now the more our ideas reach out to the people, the faster will be the pace of the revolution and the better patriots shall we produce. This struggle goes on, even long after liberation day.

Tribalism

We have already discussed the land question and showed that although this is one of the main issues connected with the national question and is central to the oppression and exploitation of our people, its importance can be over-emphasised, leading to wrong political strategy. This becomes clear when one considers the existence of parties that consider the peasants as the main and leading force, sometimes the only real force for national liberation. The Bantustan concept also promotes this wrong thinking because it leads some people to lose sight of the fact that they have the right to own the mines and industry equally as they have the right to own the land. These industries were created by their sweat on their own land. **Today the call is no longer just for the restoration of our land; it is for the restoration of our birthright and our right to self-determination and independence.**

Tribalism takes many forms and must be recognised if it is to be uprooted in time. It is the over-glorification of the tribe at the expense of the nation or other tribes. It is saying: "my tribe is better and superior and therefore I am better and superior by virtue of the accident of birth and for no other reason." This thinking must be rooted out because it plays into the hands of the enemy and is one of his best weapons. It also hinders our progress towards our declared goal of forming the nation. It is contrary to ANC teachings and struggles over many years. Although it is supposed to glorify the tribe, in actual fact it is doing insult to the tribe because, for many decades, the chiefs of the tribes by various means and approaches strove to create a nation out of the heterogeneous tribes and therefore struggled essentially to end their previous form of existence. Many took up arms and sacrificed their lives to that end. They were very conspicuous at the formation of the ANC in January, 1912, in Bloemfontein and they helped to create the nation by other means. It is necessary to note at this stage that in South Africa many chiefs have played a progressive role. This is why most chiefs who rejected Bantustans were banished or deposed, replaced by chiefs who are the creation of Vorster and Verword. In the feudal setting, the formation of the tribes out of clans was a progressive development on the road to the formation of the nation. Today in the era

of national liberation struggles and socialist transformation of society, most chiefs have become reactionary and the chieftaincy has lost its progressive content.

Today tribalism has become a convenient power base for bankrupt, discredited ambitious elements who cannot submit to the discipline of the liberation movement. Tribalism is the recruiting ground for imperialism and reaction. It is the vehicle for the most reactionary and conservative elements who resist change. It is the refuge of those overtaken by the powerful march of history. It is unpardonable for ANC militants and leaders to say "I am of this or that tribe," although the same could be said by an ordinary rural tribesman without amounting to tribalism. What is then the difference between the two? The ANC militant or leader represents the advance guard of the South African nation. He is its most reliable defender. His tribal origin is irrelevant. To us ANC militants, all the tribes are our people without exclusion and favour. Our people fought wars in order to move forward and end their tribal divisions. We cannot and should not glorify what they themselves justly wanted to end. Of course this does not mean we must be ashamed to speak about the achievements of our people. We shall always speak with pride of the resistance they showed, the battles fought and won. These are milestones in the history of our struggle. The battle of Isandlwana is mentioned even by Frederick Engels in the *Origin of the Family*. He speaks about it with pride. How can we do less? Yet there is a world of difference between the words "OUR PEOPLE" and "MY TRIBE" falling from the lips of an ANC spokesman.

Sometimes problems arise in connection with, for instance, the initiation of operations in a certain zone. In dispatching the initial trained militant to help establish a regional command, we must take into consideration the geography and demography of the place. Yet even here this is not and should not be the only consideration. An equally important consideration is that of the nation that we want to build. This nation **must be visible** in our structures. We must never lose sight of our principal goal and our success will be judged according to this criterion. The Rivonia High Command never lost sight of this. The fact that people like Nelson Mandela assumed the names of Servant John, etc., meant that they were taking into consideration the environment, but on the other hand, the very composition of the High Command clearly defined the direction and aim of our liberation struggle. Tomorrow's basis will be laid by us today. We reap what we have sown. Tribalism must never be allowed to hide behind any guise whatsoever.

The realisation of the national question poses very serious tasks and demands boldness on our part. We have to destroy the colonial heritage and the masses must see change and not imagine one. In the period of nation-building and consolidation, we shall have to adopt an uneven approach in favour of sections deliberately left behind by apartheid to correct a historical injustice.

LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921

a Marxist commentary on political events in the cause of national liberation and socialism.

30 pence monthly – £1.80 half-yearly subscription – £3.60 yearly.

(Students: £3.30 yearly – £1.70 half-yearly.)

– all post free (surface mail) from –

DEPARTMENT AC
134 Ballards Lane
London N3 2PD
England

AFRICAN PROMETHEUS

by David Evans

(for Bram Fischer, Nelson Mandela and other South African fighters against apartheid)

High
upon the krantz*
smeared with blood and snot and shit
Prometheus
is chained.
Handcuffs rasp his aching wrists
the ridge knife cuts his bleeding back
King Zeus
holds a blowtorch to his blistered face.

*krantz is Afrikaans for crag.

Nightfall
brings the eagles
like hunger lust and fear
to rip
with beak and talons
at his gut
his groin
and then it all begins again.
He prays
for death – and cannot die
cursed with endless life.

Girls
come in their mini skirts
their smooth thighs moist for love;
he feels paps soft upon his chest
the sweet sap swell his horn
hears the whispers in his ear. . .
Recant.

Zeus
stubs his fat cigar
his voice too is soft:
you stole the sacred flame for men
joined the mob behind my back
led revolt against the gods
tried to turn my world to ash
and build a new. But
I forgive.
forget that rabble.
Recant.

Hermes
comes
the messenger
soft-footed in his brown suede shoes
exit permit in his hand
We drank together at the club
you've only got to say the word
sign here on the dotted line.
Recant.

Prometheus
writhes against the rock
teeth torn lips spit out a groan
I can't.

Zeus
in his car below
tells the chauffeur to drive on
Eagle wings
blot out the sun
eagle-beaks tear out the gut
again.

Heracles
is far away
beyond the reach of telegram
while silent on the folded plains
the unseen people
seem to sleep.

But
smouldering in a sullen town
a hut fire gleams
flares
disappears.
Prometheus
endures.

PHILOSOPHY AND CLASS STRUGGLE: 1

WHY REVOLUTIONARIES NEED MARXISM

by Dialego

(This is the first in a series of four articles intended to introduce the reader to the basic elements of dialectical and historical materialism)

Revolutionaries regard themselves first and foremost as practical people dedicated to changing the world. They are rightly suspicious of those who merely talk about the injustices of apartheid and the evils of capitalism and never seem to translate their words into action. "By their deeds ye shall know them" is an old saying which admirably echoes the emphasis which Marxists themselves place upon the importance of putting things into *practice:* of constantly testing everything we say and do according to the standards of real life itself. *Why then should we bother ourselves with the study of philosophy?*

Philosophy raises questions about the nature of the world, the concept of truth, the basis of morality, and above all, the relationship which exists between our ideas and objective reality: how can all this possibly help us in waging class struggle? After all, it was Marx himself who declared that "the philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point however is to change it"[1], and there are those who claim that this supports the argument that since revolutionaries are

concerned with *changing* the world, they can and should do away with philosophy altogether.

To show why philosophy is important and why we need to make a thorough study of Marxist philosophy, dialectical materialism, in particular, we must first tackle the question of

(i) Revolution and the Need for Theory

Those who imagine that all revolutionaries need to do is *act*, forget that action on its own is not enough. (Strictly speaking, it is not even possible). No matter how passionately we hate oppression and wish to see things change, there is only one force capable of eliminating colonialism, capitalism and reaction, and that is the oppressed and exploited masses led by an *organisation* of revolutionaries. The organisation of a popular movement, the organisation of a disciplined communist party around a political programme able to unite and coordinate various forms of struggle and direct them towards a common goal, is essential.

Yet once we talk about a movement, a party and a programme we are not simply talking about action, we are talking about action which has been *thought out,* for the only way in which anyone can plan activity and produce a programme is through revolutionary thinking – the development of revolutionary theory which, if it is properly worked out, does not hold back our practical activity but rather serves as a compass which enables us to move in the direction we want to go. This is why Lenin correctly argued in his classic work, *What Is To Be Done* that

> **the role of vanguard fighter can be fulfilled only by a party that is guided by the most advanced theory**[2]

for the more difficult and dangerous the tasks facing revolutionaries, the more developed and carefully worked out their theoretical perspectives need to be. Take a way of illustrating this point, the South African Communist Party's programme, *The Road to South African Freedom.* While the iniquities of the whole apartheid system may be pretty obvious, the strategy and tactics needed to eliminate them, are not. The programme analyses the particular struggle in South Africa in the whole context of the African revolution; the special character of the colonial-type oppression from which the African, Coloured and Indian people in South Africa suffer; the role of the national democratic revolution as the vital *first step* along the road to socialism, and the importance of carrying through immediate proposals if a democratic South Africa is to be developed and consolidated. This programme is

not simply the product of years of revolutionary experience in southern African conditions: it is the product of years of experience *translated into revolutionary theory* so that the people can be shown that the ideal of a democratic and liberated South Africa is not simply a beautiful dream but is a realistic and attainable objective which can be worked and planned for, step by step.

But if we require revolutionary theory so that, in Lenin's words, we can substitute "science for dreams," [3] why do we need a special philosophical outlook as well? Why do we need to base our theory upon the principles of *dialectical materialism* which is the only logical and consistent philosophy a communist can possibly hold?

To answer this question, it is important that we understand

(ii) Philosophy as the Basis of All Our Thinking

The construction of a theory is like the construction of a house; if it is to stay up, then not only must the walls be sound, but also the foundations, and it is to the realm of philosophy we must turn if we want to make sure that our theory has strong foundations. For the truth is that *all* theory, even if it has only been worked out in relation to one particular problem, is rooted in philosophy, some overall view of the world, and even if we are unaware of the existence of this underlying "world outlook," it is there nevertheless, serving as the basis, the very foundation upon which all thought and activity rest.

But why should this matter?

It matters because in the last analysis, policies and action which are based upon a false or inadequate philosophy can only lead us into defeat and despair, for even if we hit upon a particular policy which is correct in itself – for example, the need under South African conditions to conduct armed struggle – unless the philosophical basis of our policy is *also* correct, we will make serious mistakes in carrying it through.

To explain. Dialectical materialism as the philosophical outlook of the Communist Party, enables us, as *The Road to South African Freedom* puts it,

> **to understand the world as it really is – and how to change it.** [4]

And there are in fact two inter-related elements involved here:

firstly the need to understand the world as it really is – which is, broadly speaking, a *materialist* approach, an approach which treats the world as a material force in its own right that exists independently of what we may think it or like it to be; and

secondly the need to understand this material world, either in nature or society, as a world of interconnected change and development, a world of universal conflict and contradiction between what is old and dying and what is new and struggling to be born – an approach we call *dialectical.* [5]

Fused together into a single philosophy, dialectics and materialism enable us to increasingly change the world once we have understood the laws of motion which are at work in its development. *Dialectics* alerts us to the need for change, *materialism* to the importance of bringing this change into line with the objective circumstances which actually prevail.

Supposing, for example, we misapply dialectical materialism by stressing dialectics at the expense of materialism, what is likely to happen? We will come to imagine, as ultra-leftists typically do, that our mere desire or "will" to change things is much more important than the actual conditions which have to be changed. The result? A tendency to pay insufficient attention to the precise character of the situation in which we find ourselves, the kind of popular support which exists at a particular time for a particular action, the real balance of forces between ourselves and the enemy, etc.

This kind of mistake, though based in philosophy, may have and on occasion has had, practical consequences of the most damaging kind. For example, on October 1, 1965, some leaders of the Indonesian Communist Party took part in a suicidal coup intended to oust reactionaries in the armed forces. Ignoring the real political conditions in the country and isolated from the broad masses both within and outside the party, the result was an unmitigated disaster. The right-wing were able to seize the initiative and unleash one of the worst waves of counter-revolutionary terror ever seen. Literally hundreds of thousands of communists and democrats lost their lives.

Our own movement in South Africa, initiating and guiding the transition to armed struggle in the early 1960's, failed to sufficiently foresee and prepare for the enemy's viciously brutal response to the new methods of struggle, and our ranks suffered many a grievous loss at that time. The strategy and tactics were correct, and certainly not adventuristic, but in their execution, enthusiasm for action was not matched by accurate anticipation of the likely consequences.

But what of the opposite side of the problem, the tendency to stress the materialist element of our philosophy at the expense of the dialectical? This error arises out of a tendency to be confused over the question of

(iii) Philosophy and Our "Experience"

Materialism as a popular and democratic philosophy existed long before Marx and Engels developed it into a dialectical outlook. In its stress upon an independent and material world which ideas reflect, materialism accords with what is often called our "experience" or common sense – indeed, so much so, that some argue that "with all their years of political experience, " they don't need to worry about the principles of dialectical materialism as a guide to their struggles.

Yet while this experience is always valuable and certainly preferable to the fanciful notions which pseudo-revolutionaries may carry around in their heads, on its own it is by no means enough to ensure that our activities meet with success. Experience and common sense may discourage revolutionaries from undertaking actions which are rash or ill-considered, but they may also prevent us from undertaking any revolutionary action at all!

For example, when in 1950 leading members of the Communist Party of South Africa decided in the face of the impending Suppression of Communism Act, that they had no alternative but to simply dissolve the party, some communists, both among the leadership and the rank and file, actually wrote off the possibility of forming a new party underground because of the dangers and difficulties this involved.

The point here is that if we stress the materialist component of our philosophy at the expense of the dialectical, the result will not be ultra-leftism but its twin opposite – right-wing opportunism: the tendency to overestimate the strength of the enemy so that the superficial appearances of the moment are mistaken for the deeper trends at work in historical reality. Indeed, legalistic illusions which stem from an insufficiently *dialectical* approach to politics, may even lead to the kind of unprincipled compromises which make short term gains, but weaken the movement as a whole. The willingness of Buthulezi and other former supporters of the liberation struggle to work within the Bantustan system is a different sort of example of this, for although it seems a "realistic" policy, it in fact involves underestimating the forces building up beneath the "surface" of South African society which will sweep the whole, rotten, fraudulent Bantustan scheme away. These forces beneath the surface can only be understood if we think both materialistically *and* dialectically so that we see the world in a process of constant change.

Of course, simply studying the theory of dialectical materialism will not in itself ensure that serious mistakes are not made, for the essence

of Marxist philosophy is that it has to be *practically* applied. Errors of an ultra-leftist or right-opportunist kind arise not merely out of a failure to learn about dialectical materialism – they also arise out of the failure to get to grips with the question which must now be considered, that of

(iv) Philosophy and the Concrete Study of Concrete Conditions[6]

What has been said so far about the importance of philosophy as a weapon in the class struggle should not be taken to mean (as the Maoists seem to think) that everything can be found in a little Red Book which instantly opens all doors with its simple answers.

Marxist philosophy must be understood as a *guide to action* and not as some kind of self-contained system of ideas which can be used as a substitute for the actual task of carefully studying the real world. The general principles of dialectical materialism act as a framework to assist us in our search for the laws of development at work in a particular situation so that we become more sharply in tune with the precise features of objective reality and understand how they fluidly interrelate as a process of change. The stress placed upon the importance of the national liberation struggle as the *particular* form of the class struggle to be waged under present South African conditions is a good example of the creative application of Marxist philosophy to a specific situation. One of the great achievements of Communists like Moses Kotane was that he immediately grasped (as Dr. Yusuf Dadoo puts it)

> **the need to indigenise Marxism so as to give it meaning for the millions of our workers and peasants.**[7]

for it is the specific feature of the South African situation that there can be "no working class victory without black liberation and no black liberation without the destruction of capitalism in all its forms."[8] The general principles of Marxism-Leninism have to be concretely *applied* and it is simply not good enough to speak in the abstract about the contradiction between worker and capitalist as though this is all the class struggle involved!

Lenin put the question well when he said that

> **it is not enough to be a revolutionary and an adherent of socialism or a Communist in general. You must be able at each particular moment to find the particular link in the chain which you must grasp with all your might in order to hold the whole chain and to prepare firmly for the transition to the next link . . .**[9]

For this is the essence of the dialectical materialist approach: to dis-

cover both the *particular* links in the revolutionary chain and to work out how these links fit together *as a whole*, so that the constituent elements in the struggle – "the African revolution,""the national democratic revolution" and "the struggle for socialism" – are properly integrated into a coherent and overall revolutionary strategy.

Under no circumstances can dialectical materialism serve, as Engels once put it, "as an excuse for not studying history"[10] or as a pretext for skating over the complexities of a particular situation. Indeed, why this is so will become clearer once we understand the character of

(v) Dialectical Materialism as a Philosophy of a New Type

Marxism is the first philosophy in history to thoroughly grasp the inevitability of change and the dynamic and historical character of nature and society. For the Marxist, in the words of Engels, "nothing is stable except instability, nothing is immovable except movement"[11]: in fact, the only thing which cannot alter in the universe is change itself! No wonder the white supremacists in southern Africa fear Marxism like the plague itself, for like all ruling classes, they wish to believe that their privileged way of life will last forever!

This stress upon movement and contradiction as the basic force in the universe makes dialectical materialism unique as a philosophy and sets it apart from the various philosophies, popular and ruling class, which preceded it.

To elaborate this point, it will help to distinguish

(a) philosophy as it has existed from time immemorial, as a way of looking at the world and understanding it in general terms; and

(b) philosophy as it has been conceived of by ruling class philosophers who have sought to work out their theoretical principles in a purely abstract way in a world which seems remote from the experience of the people and their social activities.

Philosophy in the *first* sense is part of everyday thought and speech and (as we have already seen) all our ideas have a basis in philosophy whether we are aware of this fact or not. Indeed, this kind of philosophy existed long before people calling themselves "philosophers" arrived on the scene, and in its earliest forms, for example in primitive communist society, such philosophy had a quality and a richness which was lost in those countries where people began to philosophise in an abstract and over-specialised way. When A. Lerumo comments that

> **the forms of primitive communism existing in Africa before European conquest embodied cultures, values and traditions in many**

> **ways far superior to those of the representatives of capitalism who invaded and destroyed them. . . [12]**

This point also applies to the vivid and lively tradition in early philosophy where ideas about truth and morality, nature and the universe were expressed through song and dance, story-telling and drama and in the democratic popular assemblies – a part of the living fabric of social practice itself.

Of course this kind of philosophy suffered from the fact that it was limited and parochial (as common sense often is today) and naturally reflected the narrow basis of tribal society, but at least it had the virtue of being in touch with popular feeling and social needs.

How did philosophy acquire its reputation as a body of thought remote from the world of reality?

The historical division of society into antagonistic classes brought the development of the division of labour to the point where manual and mental activities became sharply segregated from one another. Only the slave worked with his hands, only the gentleman exercised his mind! The philosophical product of this social division was the development of *idealism:* the theoretical outlook which places the spiritual world above the world of matter and looks upon reality as the immutable work of an Ideal Creator, an attitude which has always formed the dominant current in ruling class thought.

Although this kind of idealism seems to be so remote from reality that it is simply irrelevant to political struggle, in fact its very "remoteness" and abstraction serves the ruling class as an important ideological weapon

(a) in its efforts to perpetuate the division of labour between workers and those who are supposed to think for them – hence the notion that "ideas create reality"; and

(b) as the philosophical basis to its propagandist assertions that exploitation and class divisions are part of a divine and timeless order which nothing can change.

When Dr. Malan replied to a demand for democracy and an end to apartheid presented by the ANC in 1952, by saying that the differences between white and black "are permanent and not man made" [13], he unconsciously revealed the *practical* role which idealism plays in defending racism and exploitation by placing them above the forces of historical change. In other words, his argument demonstrates how important it is that we not only embrace a philosophy of the new type, but continue to struggle against philosophy of the old, ruling class type, for the origins of this philosophy in the division of labour and its role in

perpetuating class barriers and all forms of prejudice reveal that even the most metaphysical philosophy helps reactionaries in the class struggle. That is why we must fight it!

Of course it is true that viewed historically, idealist philosophy has played a part in developing human reason and thought, but its significance must not be exaggerated, for dialectical materialism not merely incorporates into its outlook the best of ruling class philosophy (for example, Hegel's brilliant theory of dialectics), but it also draws upon the popular and democratic tradition of philosophy as it has existed from earliest times – that form of philosophy which is intrinsic to all our thought and action and which is part and parcel of everyday life.

Dialectical materialism, that is to say, creatively combines *both* forms of philosophy we have referred to in a synthesis and that provides a philosophy of a new type. While it tackles the basic questions which the ruling class philosophers were the first to present in a universal way – the nature of our ideas and their relation to reality – it does so, not in some abstract or speculative manner, but only in the light of our knowledge of history, our experience of the class struggle and the latest developments in the world of science.

Dialectical materialism is the only philosophical outlook which enables us to approach the world dynamically, concretely and in a way which helps us link up particular problems with the struggle to liberate society and mankind as a whole.

It is therefore the natural and logical philosophy for all revolutionaries who have completely dedicated themselves to this struggle and have nothing to fear from change.

Notes

1 *Theses on Feuerbach*, No. XI, as an appendix to The German Ideology, (Moscow/London, 1964), p. 647.

2 Collected Works 5, (London/Moscow, 1961), p. 370.

3 *Fredrick Engels*, Collected Works 2, (Moscow/London, 1960), p. 20.

4 The Road to South African Freedom, p. 8.

5 The term *dialectics* was originally used by the ancient Greek philosophers to denote a method of debate and discussion in which the truth was reached when one thinker disclosed the contradictions and divisions in the argument of another. In this way, a position was turned upside down and forced to change!

6 In an article in the journal Communism, Lenin speaks of "the

very gist, the living soul of Marxism" as "a concrete analysis of a concrete situation," Collected Works 31, (Moscow/London, 1966), p. 166.

7 Introduction to B. Bunting, Moses Kotane, South African Revolutionary, (Inkululeko Publications, 1975), p. 1.

8 *Ibid.*

9 *The Immediate Tasks of Soviet Government*, Collected Works 27, (Moscow/London, 1965), p. 273.

10 *Engels to Schmidt*, 5/9/1890, Selected Correspondence, (Moscow, 1953), p. 496.

11 Engels made this comment in the article on Turkey in 1853, cited by M. Loewy, *Marxists and the National Question*, New Left Review 96, pp. 84-85.

12 Fifty Fighting Years, (Inkululeko Publications, 1971), p. 3.

13 Moses Kotane, *op. cit.*, p. 183.

BOOK REVIEWS

SOURCES OF REVOLUTION IN AFRICA

Class Struggles in Tanzania, by Issa G. Shivji, published by Heinemann and Tanzania Publishing House, £4.50.

Africa is in urgent need of Marxist-Leninist analyses of the societies of our continent. The last twenty years have seen an unprecedented rapid development of new class forces within African countries, the emergence of new forms of political domination and exploitation (militarism is a leading example), and the restructuring of traditional imperialist relations – notably in the emergence of the United States as a leading factor in neocolonialism in Africa. The content of these developments, and their implications for the struggles of oppressed Africans, have to be understood and used by progressive forces: and yet it is true that, save in a few areas and instances, political debate and practice are dominated by imperialist ideology and its local bourgeois and petty-bourgeois variants. Where proletarian consciousness and political development have been much more advanced, and in areas where popular revolutionary struggle has transformed consciousness (Southern Africa generally and Angola are leading examples, of course) this domination of reactionary ideas has been effectively challenged or even completely

displaced. But for many countries, the level of political analysis and ideological struggle remains relatively backward.

Shivji's book, a product of a leading member of the circle of "left" academics at the University of Dar es Salaam, certainly addresses itself to many of the main issues. It attempts to define the class structure of Tanzania, to analyse the class character of the Tanzanian state, and to describe the leading class forces locked in political struggle for supremacy. Most of the discussion, of course, relates to the concrete situation in Tanzania – and his particular political conclusions here may safely be left to be debated and resolved by Tanzanian revolutionaries themselves. But the implications he draws have a much wider application – to the definition of ruling classes in Africa, and especially to questions of the political strategy of progressive forces in neocolonial African countries.

Central to Shivji's analysis is the notion that the ruling class in Tanzania and a larg number of other African countries is the "bureaucratic bourgeoisie" – defined here as the section of the petty bourgeoisie (clerks, professionals, teachers, traders, etc.) who emerged around independence to take control of the state and transform it into an instrument of accumulation for their own class benefit. In the particular Tanzanian case, says Shivji, this class has in fact succeeded in destroying its potential bourgeois rivals (notably the overwhelmingly Asian commercial bourgeoisie) and therefore reigns supreme over workers and peasants. The interests of the bureaucratic bourgeoisie are objectively in accord with imperialism (indeed the State performs "modernizing" functions to facilitate imperialist penetration), and lie in the increasing exploitation of a quiescent proletriat and peasantry. The only political alternative to their rule lies through a victorious class struggle against bureaucratic bourgeois power by an alliance of workers and poor peasants.

Now this general line of analysis clearly contains important truths – especially the fact that a critical aspect of the development of neocolonial capitalism in Africa has been the use of the state apparatus by a voracious but weak petty bourgeoisie to build up its position. But there are three major reservations.

Firstly, there are serious flaws, in my view, in Shivji's analysis of the Tanzanian state, accentuated by empirical arguments which are often superficial or downright inadequate and misleading. For example, he dismisses the ideology of the bureaucratic bourgeoisie (1½ pages out of 180 are devoted to this "unimportant" topic!) as "hardly evolved", and subsisting in bureaucratism and technocratic expertise (pp. 96-7).

Yet on the very next page he refers to the "most important role played by the bureaucratic bourgeoisie in the sphere of ideology", and specifically to its "vigorous anti-imperialism", support for liberation movements and so on! There is no real discussion of how this comes about, nor of the reasons for the fact, obvious to any observer of Tanzanian affairs, that the development of state structures (including especially the ruling party, TANU) has involved introducing a variety of progressive ideas and revolutionary cadres into the State apparatus.

This leads to the second objection to Shivji's analysis – that he has failed, in the end, to provide an adequate account of *either* the bureaucratic bourgeoisie as a class, *or* of the material basis of its power in state monopoly capitalism. Shivji is claiming that, although the occupants of the upper echelons of the State do not accumulate capital (the State does that) but merely consume income, they are nevertheless the direct beneficiaries of the process of exploitation and accumulation *as a class.* Now it would require a novel argument – which he does not provide – to establish that they are truly bourgeois, in the absence of any other significant bourgeois fraction in the society existing outside the state machine to which the high state functionaries were structurally akin. In many African countries, it would be more accurate to say that the state functionaries, while petty bourgeois in character in terms of their class position as defined by State employment, are nevertheless able to use the state (including corruption, relations with imperialism, etc) to transform their own positions by accumulating capital. For the *state* to be characterised as operating in the interests of the bourgeoisie (as it clearly does in most African countries) involves only the *general* political dominance of capitalism, either through an indigenous bourgeoisie or, more characteristically, through imperialist domination via local auxiliaries and agents representing local comprador interests, mainly of a petty bourgeois type.

One suspects, however, that the reason for Shivji's rather strained line of reasoning in this area is his underlying political purpose – which brings us to the third set of objections to the book's arguments. Shivji is trying to erect a picture of the Tanzanian state as one of unambiguous bureaucratic bourgeois rule in order to argue that *only* a worker-poor peasant alliance against the state can transform the position of the exploited classes of Africa. In order to do this, he must deny, in the face of reality, that there are significant class contradictions *within* the state in Tanzania itself, and avoid asking which classes and strata of the population are being oppressed by imperialism, and can therefore be recruited in the anti-imperialist struggle. and secondly, what forms of

political organization, ideology and work are essential to ensure that the *dominant* political force of the anti-imperialist alliance is the working class. The ultra-left position espoused by Shivji and his colleagues bears little relation to these critical points, for it assumes a stage of crystallization of class forces and struggles far in advance of most African countries – and perhaps for this reason Shivji's discussion of proletarian struggles in Tanzania is the most unsatisfactory part of the book, a combination of wishful thinking and sliding over "awkward" ambiguities. Ultimately, this superficially revolutionary political position makes impossible the creative application of Marxist theory to African problems.

This failure to tackle the political problems of anti-imperialist unity and of prolonged (and potentially very "reversible") non-capitalist transition in countries such as Tanzania is accompanied by a comparable lack of real analysis of imperialism and of the international dimensions of African political struggles – a lack which perhaps conceals other ultra-left positions only hinted at in the text. Shivji states, for example (p.86) that "the advocates of 'peaceful co-existence' invariably hinder the revolutionary activities of the 'third world' people with the threat of a world war. The threat of the 'third world war' has become their pet argument against the revolutionary activities of the oppressed people." The people of Angola would no doubt be interested to hear from Mr. Shivji about how Soviet and Cuban advocates of peaceful coexistence "hindered their revolutionary activities". They may be even more interested to know that the mini-group with which Shivji is associated, perhaps dancing to another's tune, has in other contexts condemned those who support MPLA as "sectarian"! Who hinders African revolution, indeed?

A. Langa

FORCED LABOUR ON THE MINES

CHIBARO: African Mine Labour in Southern Rhodesia 1900-33, by Charles van Onselen. Pluto Press, London, 1976.

Gold, the alluring prospect of a 'second Rand', drew the colonialists towards Zimbabwe at the close of the nineteenth century. Under the ambitious leadership of Rhodes, they carved out a new piece of Empire, only to discover that Rhodesia's gold-bearing reefs, unlike the Rand,

were low-grade and widely dispersed. In the first ten years of the industry, only two mines paid any dividends, out of some 200 companies. By 1903 the reconstruction of the industry was imperative.

There then emerged a more 'rational' structure in which a few large mines produced 40% of total gold output, and small workers mined the numerous smaller deposits, paying royalties to the British South Africa Company, and sometimes getting loans from it. Output maximisation and cost-cutting helped to put the industry on its feet, so that by 1911 it employed 2,255 whites and 37,000 blacks. The years 1909-11 saw a big influx of South African capital, which established the dominant role in the industry it has retained ever since.

Thus although the new colony of Rhodesia never turned out to be the Eldorado the 'pioneers' hoped for, it did provide a stable mining industry as the basis for white settler wealth. Between 1924 and 1940 gold provided from 36% to 66% of the colony's exports, and minerals comprised two-thirds to three-quarters of all exports.

Yet, in relation to the Rand, it was still a poor cousin. And it had to compete with the Rand for labour. In the 'free' labour market for skilled whites this meant paying more than the reef mines were offering. But in the labour market for unskilled black labour, no 'freedom' could be allowed because the weaker Rhodesian mining industry could not successfully compete with its stronger and larger South African counterpart. Thus was developed a system of labour recruitment and repression which was highly coercive, exploitative, effective, and criminally destructive of human health and happiness.

Charles van Onselen has written a comprehensive description and critique of this labour system. His account thoroughly documents and exposes the horrors of this early stage in the operations of monopoly capital in a colonial context. Between 1900 and 1934 the Rhodesian mines produced £89 million worth of gold; in the same period over 30,000 black workers lost their lives in the Rhodesian mines, 27,000 from disease and 3,000 from accidents. African wages became the main victim of the mine-owners' constant search for ways of reducing costs, with the result that in this same period, overall African miners' wages fell by between a quarter and a third.

Labour so unrewarding, dangerous and hard could not attract workers in the ordinary way. It needed compulsion, and the central institution organising the supply of forced labour, the RNLB (Rhodesian Native Labour Board, similar to Wenela) became widely known in the whole Central-East African region as *Chibaro* (or *isibalo*, *cibalo*, *shibaru*) – a term denoting at one and the same time slavery, forced

labour, contract labour. In the crucial early years, when the industry was struggling to establish its viability as a profit-earning field for capital investment, the RNLB supplied a third to a half of all the black labour used on Rhodesian mines. Later, as the compound system developed, taxation bit deep and the pressure of population on the land grew, stabilising the flow of African labour to the mines, *Chibaro's* importance diminished, until in the twenties it was supplying under 10% of the industry's African labour. But it had helped to determine a pattern which long outlived the period of forced labour recruitment.

The author shows in fascinating detail the many aspects of the system of near-total control which the employers, backed up by the State, imposed on the African workers. Wages, the credit system, the mine stores, the control of food supplies (especially meat), even the satisfaction of social needs (liquor, recreation and prostitution) were all manipulated to maintain a large labour force in a state of passive acquiescence. But conditions were intolerable, the cruelties and humiliations often unbearable, and resistance to these pressures (which seems to have gone on most of the time, except among those too demoralised or physically shattered) did sometimes erupt into outspoken protests and militant strikes. The largest of these was at the Shamva mine in 1927 when 3,500 workers came out. (Van Onselen has written up this event elsewhere, and his treatment of it in this book is unfortunately rather cursory. More detail about the many strikes and stoppages, and more about the modes of labour organisation – none of which could be sustained very long -- would have been welcome).

Nobody interested in the formation of the African working class should miss this book. It is written from a progressive and materialist viewpoint, but suffers a little from the use of fashionable jargon (e.g. centre-periphery, labour coercion, proletarianisation, etc. – terms which the writer imagines are deeply conceptual, but which actually are merely descriptive, and not very precise at that). There is a gratuitous comparison with labour camps in the Soviet Union which is offensive. But for the rest, the book is so refreshingly clear and original, the source material so wide, rich and ingeniously used, that one wants to pass over the blemishes. Interesting historical and theoretical problems are suggested, and one now waits eagerly for somebody with a firm grasp of dialectical and historical materialism to do what Van Onselen (like Francis Wilson) has failed to do; and that is to look at mining capital and labour together, in their complex opposition and interdependence, as classes. But Van Onselen, a social historian, has gone further

and deeper than Wilson the economist, and it is a tribute to his work that he raises expectations – and standards of historical writing.

J. Villiers

TOWNSHIP LIFE DESCRIBED BUT NOT ANALYSED

Urban Man in Southern Africa, Edited by Clive Kileff and Wade C. Pendleton. Published by Mambo Press, USA.

Urban Man in Southern Africa consists of a number of research essays into aspects of urban life in South Africa, Zambia, Zimbabwe (Rhodesia) and Namibia (South-West Africa). All the contributors are social anthropology lecturers and researchers who, according to the bibliography supplied in the book, have made Southern Africa their speciality and have made various contributions in the past on aspects of urban development in this area.

In the introduction by W.C. Pendleton we are informed that this socio-economic sub-system on the African continent is chosen as a priority area for two main reasons:

(i) because of the fact of white supremacy rule in all these countries except Zambia, and

(ii) because of the high percentage of people resident in urban areas – 27% as compared with 17% for sub-Saharan Africa excluding these countries.

Significantly, none of the contributions in any way deals with the impact of racism and white supremacy rule on some of the social phenomena under study. In his forword to the book we are reminded by Professor William McCord, Professor and Chairman of Sociology, City College of New York, that "most of the authors are extremely careful to avoid political comments and to refrain from drawing political implications from their work."

Articles range from a study of the independent African churches in Soweto; the current wave of industrial strikes in South Africa; language in Windhoek (Namibia); to the study of the black elite in Zimbabwe; social networks in Zambia and urban Shona music.

This book appears at a time when the attention of Africa and the imperialist and anti-imperialist forces of the world has been focussed on Southern Africa where Portuguese colonialism has been smashed by the peoples of Mozambique and Angola, where the white minority racist

regimes of Smith and Vorster are facing intensified struggles for national liberation and where the balance of forces has overwhelmingly shifted in favour of the revolutionary forces against white supremacy rule, colonialism and racism. One is left wth a distinct impression that the writers are either oblivious of the historic changes taking place or, more correctly perhaps, they share in common with bourgeois sociologists/anthropologists in general, an inability to penetrate into the real essence of social phenomena, which, though accurately observed and described, are nevertheless not adequately explained.

To give a few examples:

After much detailed information about Soweto (life, population); about the number of independent African churches; the distinction between the Zionist and Ethiopian churches in practice and the personal relationships formed between members of a given congregation and other congregations, Martin West's conclusions are:

Firstly, the churches provide a "satisfactory system of religion" for people within the urban areas, and

Secondly, the churches provide "important outlets for the exercise of leadership", since political venues are largely closed to the African people.

What is the content of Christian teaching within these churches? To what end does the leadership of the churches exercise leadership and, crucially, what do the members (4 million Africans belong to such churches we are informed) who form part of the nationally oppressed majority in South Africa, expect from their church leaders? And in general what social role does the church perform in a racist society? On these questions, no comment is made and we are left merely with a mass of facts and descriptions. Even within the terms of reference of the article the essence of "independence" of the independent African churches is not examined – is it independence merely from the domination of white church hierarchy within Mission churches or affiliation to such churches as an expression of the desire by the African members for freedom from white domination in general? After all, the essence of the black theology movement, particularly as it has been stated by leading black churchmen (at the Hammanskraal Convention of December, 1974, for example) lies precisely within the ambit of this latter broad desire by black Christians.

Brian M. du Toit's "Strike or You're in Trouble" deals with the wave of industrial strikes that has been sweeping over South Africa ever since the end of 1972. At the time he wrote this article he was present in Durban during 1973. Du Toit describes the host of legislative measures

adopted by successive white supremacist governments restricting pay, jobs, residence, work permits, trade unionism (inadequately dealt with in its historic development), cost of living (including some useful tables of income and expenditure for African families) and concludes with an account of the actual strikes themselves. His conclusion is the by now familiar and increasingly voiced demand by sections of the industrial bourgeoisie and liberal economists that African workers should be paid higher wages, at least above the Poverty Datum Line. To his personal credit, however, Du Toit goes further, advocating genuine trade union rights for black workers as well as permanent residence within the urban areas.

What he, like many other idealistic individuals, fails to grasp is that, given the integrated system of apartheid as a whole, demands for trade union rights as well as rights of permanent residence in the African townships are anathema to the South African regime.

Crucially, what Du Toit and other liberal reformers refuse to accept is that the nature of class and national oppression in South Africa demands a revolutionary, as opposed to partial reformist, solution. Black workers, whilst their immediate demands are better working conditions and higher wages, faced as they are with a sharp deterioration in their living standards to the point of widespread poverty, are increasingly resorting to strike action in the face of police brutality (and even murder) not merely for economic demands, but for political demands. The two are inseparable.

As a last example of the superficiality and lack of in-depth real analysis by bourgeois anthropologists, we are given a pure description, without even an attempt at analysis of the observations, of the style of life of the "social elite" consisting of the professionals (teachers, doctors, civil servants) and businessmen in Zimbabwe. What role, if any, this minority plays within the developing struggle for national liberation, what its actual position is within the context of the people's struggle and even attitudes to this are unexamined. Can anyone be blamed for reaching the conclusion that since this elite appears purely as a one-dimensional group with a life style akin to white middle class Rhodesians any study devoted to it is irrelevant? Or is it that the researcher's own limitations force him to the absurd position of a descriptive essayist?

There is, however, another question which needs to be asked: Since we are left with a wholly inadequate understanding and analysis of the social phenomena dealt with, of what practical use are these studies? To be sure, the body of factual material contained in them is useful, and

to be sure the articles can be of interest to those who wish to know something about the urban environment in Southern Africa. Apart from this one might be tempted to dismiss the contributions as trivial except that Professor McCord addresses his remarks not only to scholars who may find the articles useful, but also to "civil servants and statesmen concerned with the future of Africa". Knowledge and facts after all are the raw materials for the shaping of policy by all "concerned with the future of Africa".

S. Maharaj

THE FORMATION OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN IMAGE IN RUSSIA

Aspects of a Far-off Land, by A.B. Davidson and V.A. Makrushin. Science Publishers, Moscow.

In this book two Soviet scientists examine how Russia became acquainted with African history, mainly with the southern part of the continent and Madagascar. Most of their information has been culled from archives – old writings, books and maps which embody the first information about South Africa available to the Russian people.

The source of this knowledge is traced back to the time of Peter the Great, when the books of Western European writers, Dutch, English and French travellers were studied. In 1793, during the time of Yeketerina 1, a two-volumed book by a French naturalist Fransus Valian describing his voyages was published in Moscow. For its time it was one of the best western books about South Africa available.

By the second half of the 18th century there were already Russians who had been to South Africa, especially sailors. Among them were military officers who had been trained in the British fleet because Russian ships did not sail in southern seas until the beginning of the 19th century.

But dating from 1798 we have a record of the stay in Cape Town of a well-known musician and scientist Gerasim Lebedev who lived and gave concerts there, and whose African diaries, notes and letters from Africa give an interesting insight into the life of the times. In a letter dated September 15, 1798, he wrote:

"On Saturday two black people from Mozambique were hanged for killing their cruel master, who had bought them from an auction sale".

Lebedev criticised and condemned such practices. He accused the Cape Town authorities of tyranny and wanted the world to know about their vicious barbarism.

The first Russian ship anchored off the South African coast in April 1808 and remained in South African waters for 13 months. Its captain was Vasily Golovnin who made extensive notes during his stay in Simonstown and Cape Town. His notes were published many times during his lifetime and after his death. Golovnin exhaustively describes the way of life in Cape Town in those days, the worst feature of which, he says, was the treatment of the slaves by the colonists.

"The most important among their defects, in my opinion, is the cruelty with which they treat most of their slaves . . . . In this colony slaves are badly maintained", he writes.

More than a century ago, in 1873, a book of collected stories and legends about the Zulus and the Khoi-khoi was published.

Davidson and Makrushin describe the way in which information about South Africa was collected and disseminated in Russia, how people thought and talked about South Africa, how information about it was presented in the schools, what sort of image of the country was contained in essays and fiction.

Their book (incidentally Davidson's third on South Africa) testifies to the great interest in South Africa displayed by the Russian people in the past, and the great importance attached in the Soviet Union today to understanding its past and present. The book has been extensively reviewed in scientific and mass journals in the Soviet Union.

P.N.

A UNIQUE FIGURE IN SOUTH AFRICAN HISTORY

Moses Kotane, South African Revolutionary, by Brian Bunting, published by Inkululeko Publications, 39 Goodge Street, London W1.

It is, I suspect, inevitable that any "political biography" of a man like Moses Kotane should be more of a political history than a true biography. For Kotane, politics has always been the real stuff of life. Even now, over 71 years old, partially invalided by a stroke, his life is more involved with politics than with self. His life story encompasses over thirty years during which he was at once secretary general of the South African Communist Party and one of the foremost national executive

members of the African National Congress, apart from the years of political discovery and apprenticeship before he graduated to either position. His apprenticeship in politics was served in the formative years, when both communists and nationalists were struggling to bring forth, from their own experiences, answers to the formidable political challenges of South Africa's unique caste-and-colour systems of oppression. The years of his political maturity and power were the years in which ideologies had become clear, and in which small communist and nationalist sects grew into influential mass movements, imprinting their stamp on the whole South African scene. There is a wealth of fascinating dilemma, decision and action in those years.

But Kotane's own part in them, his own contributions to the paths chosen and the dilemmas resolved is, I believe, greater than this biography reveals, as those who have personal knowledge of the politics of the period will confirm. Kotane is not just a veteran, a survivor; he was one of those at the centre, making the decisions, deciding the actions which shaped history. That this special role of Moses Kotane does not emerge sharply in this "political biography" is not a criticism of the writer, but rather an inevitable reflection of the character of the subject. Kotane is a man of vigorous, often aggressive individuality, as his whole political career showed; he never hesitated to impose the full weight of his powerful personality and intellect on all about him when the seriousness of the issues warranted it. He fought stubbornly for his beliefs – regardless of their popularity – with the singlemindedness that wins battles but also makes enemies. He held fiercely to his own, independent views, with scant regard for formal Marxist texts or nationalist dogmas, often to the dismay of the orthodox in both categories.

But for all his stubborn self-willedness – seen by his critics often as arrogance – there is no part of his make-up which fosters self-praise or self-advertisement. He was, at the time he left South Africa in 1963, probably the most respected of the top echelon of ANC leaders, and at the same time the least publicised, the least photographed, the one furthest from becoming a cult figure. There is a unique quality to the man; an orator of unimpassioned style, who carries an audience through the considered weight of his words rather than the drama of his delivery; an organiser of action, who carries his followers through weight of persuasion and personality rather than charm or charisma. Such a man gives little aid to a biographer. He talks easily, forcefully of politics and people, little of self. Such records as he has, whether documents or memories, are of events, conflicts, struggles – and not of his own spe-

cial participation in them. It will come as no surprise, then, to those who know Kotane that Brian Bunting's biography is long on politics, short on biography. It is indeed, the history of forty years of political growth, struggle and change, which framed Kotane's life. It is not – by contrast with so many biographies of famous men – the history of a man, coloured by the reflected light of the events about him.

And what a fine history this is. Bunting is not the first to attempt to write the historical record of almost half a century, during which the separate strands of class and national struggles were knit so close together. But his is certainly the best researched and scholarly, presenting a mass of material and documents, many of which are new to this reviewer at least, and have never previously been accessible to the general public. Documents, in themselves, are only the skeletal evidence of historical events. It is for the writer historian to flesh them out with appraisal and understanding, to assess their significance within the whole train of events of which they are only a small part, to interpret their meaning not only in the light of hindsight of our age, but also in the light in which their drafters conceived them. This is the real writer's task. And Brian Bunting has achieved it, assisted no doubt by the subject who stood at or near the centre of events, casting his own considerable weight into the turmoils, and setting his own special mark upon their resolutions. New light is thus thrown on the politics of the period, from which every student of South African history can learn a great deal, even if some of the interpretations are, still, controversial.

But if less than justice has been done to Kotane's own personal contribution to that history, I suspect it is because he wanted it that way. To paint the portrait of Kotane large would have overshadowed the events, the politics. That was never his style. Yet as one who has known and worked in politics with him for many years and yet discovered little of the biographer's man behind the public front, I still hope that somehow, sometime, a writer will persuade him to turn his attention inwards for a while, and let the rest of the biography of Moses Kotane emerge.

T.

FORCED LABOUR FOR COLOURED WORKERS

A memorandum prepared by the Campaign Against Racial Discrimination, Cape Town.

"Our main punishment was to be sent to the cells or to be beaten with a stick. Wherever we worked in the camp somone stood over us. We felt as if we were constantly treated as if being punished."

– One of the cadets from the training centre.

"We (the ruling class) are now forced as a result of these years of neglect (by the state) to introduce a system of labour camps – all right, call them training camps and make it sound as nice as possible – as part of South Africa's economic and social life."

– Mrs Catherine Taylor, United Party M.P.

Recent press reports of widespread arrests of "Coloured" youths in and around Cape Town for non-registration in terms of the 1967 Cadet Act and the strong resulting discontent induced CARD (Campaign Against Racial Discrimination) to investigate the background and practice of the system.

South African society is characterised by the presence of forced labour. The African labour force is usually the target of this coercion ("rehabilitation centres", prisons, Bantu Labour Act), but in recent years part of the "Coloured" labour force has been drawn into this scheme. Statutory laws and administrative edicts have taken over from

the market laws of supply and demand.

South Africa's mines, farms and factories have been built up on the backs of cheap, disciplined and preferably submissive labourers. It is against this background that the Training Centres for Coloured Cadets Act No 46 of 1967 must be seen.

The Act was introduced by the Minister of Coloured Affairs and was supported by the official opposition (The United Party) and more significantly by the Federated Chamber of Industries. To make the Act more "acceptable", the support of various Government nominated and financed "Coloured leaders" was harnessed. The Progressive Party's sole parliamentary representative opposed the Bill in toto,[1] as did the Teachers' League of South Africa.

The Labour Party, while not opposing the bill in toto, called on parents not to allow their sons to register for service until facilities and wage rates equal to those of white military trainees were offered.

The Act and Regulations

The central provision of the Act is to establish centres for the compulsory training of cadets *for any kind of employment.*

All men between the ages of 18 and 24 and classified as Coloured *must* register for training. Failure to register makes the person liable to be arrested and sentenced to a fine not exceeding R200 or imprisonment up to 6 months or both, and enforced registration.

It is this aspect, among others, which gives the training camp the characteristics of a conscripted labour camp. On registering, a registration certificate is issued. The certificate must be produced within 7 days when demanded by a policeman or other registering officer. (This period of grace was granted as a concession to the opposition. In practice it is often ignored, juding from Press reports of arrests.)

Moving the second reading of the Bill, the Minister of Coloured Affairs said, "I want to give the House the assurance that in this case it is not the intention to employ raids, general interrogation in the streets and large scale prosecutions." – (*Hansard*, 20.2.1967)

Two years later ministerial patience had apparently worn thin, for he told parliament, "Raids may be carried out to obtain recruits for the Coloured Cadet Training Centre if Coloured youths of 18 continue to ignore appeals to register." – (*Rand Daily Mail*, 10.5.1969)

By 1976 the situation had reached the point where the Press were reporting: "Seventy-nine youths have been arrested since 9th June in Athlone for not registering for service in the Coloured Cadets, a spokes-

man for the Athlone Police said yesterday" – (*Cape Times*, 15.6.1976)

From the recruits, the selection board set up in terms of the Act may (i.e. the Board had a discretion) exempt those who:

a) are full time students or scholars
b) are permanent workers and apprentices
   or who
c) possess mental or bodily defects
d) by undergoing training would face undue hardship
e) are unfit to undergo training for any reason.

The Board may exempt any recruit permanently or for such period or on such conditions as the Board may determine. If it is borne in mind that one of the motives (see below) of the Act is to produce "trained and disciplined" workers" this power of the Board becomes ominous. Cadets who are *not* permanently and unconditionally exempted are on parole as it were.

Where a worker has not been working to the satisfaction of his employer, he may be dismissed, sent to the training camp and then be employed later by the same employer.

The following was reported by the newspaper *Post* (29.11.1970) "An 18 year old Athlone boy, Michael O'Shea was dismissed from his job and sent to Cadet camp. O'Shea, an apprentice plumber, was sacked at the end of October and the next day ordered to report to Cadet Camp in Faure."

It was admitted by the Coloured Representative Council Executive member in charge of Welfare and Pensions that the Department of Coloured Affairs was aware that O'Shea had been working, and that O'Shea's boss had reported him to be sent to camp and said that he did so in the boy's own interest.

This after assurances by a Nationalist M.P. that "this measure (does) not interfere either with the studies of Coloured students or with the work of those who are employed." – (Mr J.P.A. Reynecke – *Hansard*, 2.3.1967)

The threat of being sent to a labour camp must surely influence workers to be more docile. To this extent it is a psychological weapon in the hand of the employers.

While only a few hundred Coloured workers are at present being called up, fear of this fate influences many thousands.

"Perhaps many of these people will never see the training centres because the fact that they have been registered will prompt them to greater serviceability". – Dr S.W. van der Merwe NAT – *Hansard* 20.2.1967)

A recruit who is selected for training and who fails to report for this when called upon to do so will be liable on conviction to maximum penalties of a fine of R500 or imprisonment for 3 years or both.

Training includes physical exercises, sport, drilling exercises and the performance of any kind of work, but consists mainly of training for any kind of employment. The normal training period is for one year. This may be extended to a a further training period of not more than one year if the cadet has not rendered "satisfactory service". Cadets spend 4 months in the labour camp at Faure and the rest of the period in employment.

Shoddy work or indiscipline at his place of employment can result in the cadet doing a further period of training (cheap labour?) at the labour camp, or a lengthening of his period of training of up to one year.

As the Minister of Coloured Affairs explained, "Cadets who are placed in employment with a view to training in the private sector but who fail to perform their duties or to make satisfactory progress will have to go back to the State-controlled centre."

In other words there will be a very powerful incentive for such youths to put their hearts and souls into their work lest they be endorsed into the labour camp.

Any period during which a cadet serves a sentence of imprisonment or is absent from the labour camp or his place of employment without leave is not taken into consideration in determining the duration of a cadet's training.

Both the Act and the regulations issued thereunder make provision for the disciplining of cadets. Cadets can be charged in a magistrate's court for contravening or failing to comply with any regulations and be sentenced to a fine of up to R200, imprisonment up to 6 months or confinement at a training camp.

Cadets who are absent without leave from the labour camp or their place of employment are, if convicted, liable to a fine not exceeding 3 years or to both such fine and such imprisonment. The effect of this is as in the Army, to make desertion a criminal offence. It is thus true to say that cadets are subject to military discipline and all that it entails. Any cadet who refuses or fails to undergo to the best of his ability any training he is required to undergo in terms of the Act is subject to similar penalties.

In terms of the regulations if a cadet inter alia contravenes the rules or the regulations applicable to the training centre, and wilfully disobeys any rightful order or instruction given by a person authorised to

give such order or instruction and uses indecent language or acts in an insolent or threatening manner or in any manner whatsoever causes discontent, unrest and insubordination amongst cadets and conducts himself in a manner prejudicial to good order and discipline or unlawfully admits any female person to any part of a training centre, he shall be guilty of an offence. The principal is given the right to try the offender in certain instances. The principal of the centre is empowered to impose on a cadet, upon conviction, any one or more of the following punishments: namely a reprimand, forfeiture of privileges for a period not exceeding 4 months, forfeiture of allowances, increase in the normal hours of work to the extent of, or pack-drill exercises not exceeding, 3 hours per day for a period not exceeding 3 days and confinement. If the principal of the training centre decides to impose punishment, he must send the details to the magistrate of the district who may confirm or set aside or vary the punishment.

That cadets in private employment are subject to military discipline is confirmed by a further regulation which deserves to be quoted in full: "Until such time as a cadet is finally discharged, he shall at all times, wherever he may be, remain subject to these regulations as if he were within the confines of a training centre."

The threat of draconian punishments must surely "persuade" all but the most courageous and defiant cadet that to attempt to change the status quo both politically and economically is not worth his while.

A cadet may study in his spare time only with the permission of the principal. The number of working hours in every week shall not exceed 56 excluding time taken up by meals and the tidying of dormitories. This in effect works out at 10 hours work every working day – something which would not be tolerated by a free labour force.

During his training the cadet receives such pay and allowances as the Minister of Coloured Affairs together with the Minister of Finance may determine.

When a cadet is placed in employment the regulations state that "he shall receive the wages normally applicable to persons performing the same work at such a place, but in any event not less than the pay and the cash value of privileges received from the State by cadets at a training centre." It might be asked what are the advantages to employers of employing cadets if they are subject to the same wages as other workers. The answer lies in the fact that the cadets are bound on the pain of punishment to be submissive, docile and unquestioning. Cadets while at the labour camp are protected by neither the Industrial Conciliation Act No. 28 of 1956 nor the Wage Act No. 5 of 1957 and

are thus accorded no legalised bargaining power in respect of wages and working conditions.

Unlike other workers, e.g. shop and factory workers, cadets are not automatically entitled as of right to leave, instead the consent of the principal has to be obtained even when they are working in private employment.

At the conclusion of his training, the cadet is isssued with a discharge certificate. If the conduct of a cadet during his period of training is regarded as mainly unsatisfactory, his discharge certificate may be endorsed accordingly. Given the fact that employers are likely to demand the production of a satisfactory discharge certificate from ex-cadets, this is yet another "incentive" for a cadet to conform. The conditions for the issuing of a satisfactory discharge certificate are self-explanatory, namely (the cadet) did not, during his training, commit any serious breach of the domestic rules which could harm the good order and discipline at the centre; during his training he was not convicted of any serious contravention of the regulations; by his conduct he had set a good example to others during his training etc.

Motivation for the Act

"The aim of the new Cadet Training Centre at Faure is to build up a feeling of national pride among Coloured youths, as well as pride in their work, and to provide the private sector with trained and disciplined workers." – (Col. J.C. van Dyk, Principal of the Centre, addressing a management seminar, quoted *Argus* 21.11.1969)

There were various stated motives for the Act being introduced. One of the main motives was to provide "indigenous, reliable" labour to replace "foreign" (African) labour in the Western Cape. Since 1955 it has been state policy to attempt to remove African workers from this area. This policy which was presented as a safeguard to Coloured workers who were asked to see African workers as threatening their jobs, served no other function than to divide the labour force still further and to prevent "mixing" of Coloured and African workers. "Mnr Viljoen (die Minister) het gese die kleurlinge gaan geleer word om werk te doen. Hy gaan sy eie volk dien. Hy gaan Wes-Kaapland vir die bruinman en die blanke beskerm en beveilig met sy arbeid." – *(Die Burger 8.3.1967)* (Mr Viljoen – the Minister – said that the Coloured is going to be taught to work. He is going to serve his own people. He is going to protect and secure the Western Cape for the Coloureds and the Whites with his labour).[2]

While at first it was also envisaged that this labour would be used in the agricultural sector, the cadets have increasingly been utilized by the expanding state sector and more particularly its security arms e.g. police, prisons, army and navy. Those who are not employed by this sector are absorbed probably by the business and farming sectors. Given the inadequacy of Coloured education, freedom from compulsory military training and the decline in the role and influence of the churches, there has been a gap in the process of socialisation of Coloured youths as "trained and disciplined workers" to feed the needs of the economy. The answer thereto lay in the Cadet Act – "As far as Whites are concerned, military service was expanded . . . . Something similar is now envisaged for the young Coloured adults in order to lend some direction to their lives and to train them for some kind of work."

– Minister of Coloured Affairs, 20.2.1967)

One extra added benefit of the Act to employers and the State is that the cadets could provide a useful, docile scab labour force in times of strikes and riots. While as yet they have never been utilized in this role, the existence of a conscripted labour force poses a direct threat to the rest of the working class's bargaining power.

Conditions at the Camp

Two cadets were interviewed about their reasons for registering and conditions at the camp – they requested to remain anonymous. Cadet A said he registered for training because of his parents' fears that he would be arrested if he did not.

"I spent 6 months at the camp. When I was recruited I was earning R23 a month; in the camp we were all paid R9 a month no matter what we did."

Twenty-four people slept in a room, and a "sergeant" and "corporal" were chosen by each room. Many of the people in A's troop had been employed when called up.

"Discipline was extremely strict. All out thinking was done for us and if we did not toe the line, we were beaten with a stick. Our main punishment was to be sent to the cells, usually for a week. This was mainly for fighting, gambling or drinking."

No one in A's troop was employed outside the camp and he was surprised to learn that such a provision existed.

Most cadets worked in the camp or were drilled.

"We hated working in the camp because someone always stood over us. We especially hated having to work in our superior's gardens. Most

of us found this very degrading."

Food was described as "all right, but never enough."

Cadet B said that work was much easier to obtain with a good reference from the camp.

"What we all hated was that we felt we were constantly being treated as if we were being punished."

"I especially hated the forced long distance running and being made to crawl through the dust."

"Once a cadet was beaten till he bled and then tied to a pole. His friends had to carry him while he was still tied to the pole. The beating took place in the bush and the authorities did not know about it."

Films about the camps were shown, telling cadets about the way officers would like them to live.

Complaints of other cadets centred on too little food, fear of corporal punishment and receiving unfavourable references from the camp or employers.

It should be noted that the Act and Regulations make provision for a maximum period of only 3 days detention in the cells, not the week which Cadet A claimed was usual.

Further, it should be noted that corporal punishment is expressly ruled out in terms of the Regulations.

Regulation J 35 reads:

"An instructor shall not strike or assault a cadet, except in self-defence or in defence of someone else . . . . "

The interviews seem to indicate that there is a marked tendency to disregard the regulations and for those legally responsible to turn a blind eye or at least be "uninformed" as to daily practice.

Success of registration scheme and training

Originally 90,000 youths were to be included in the initial registration and every year after, 20,000. This was reduced to an estimated yearly registration-expectation of 15,000. In the most successful year, as regards registration – 1973 – 9,331 registered.

Mr J. de la Rey de Kock, Commissioner for Coloured Affairs, said on May 2. 1974 that only 40 per cent of Coloured youths between the ages of 18 and 24 registered.

December 1972 – Mr F.L. Gaum, Commissioner for Coloured Affairs at the time, said 73 per cent of all cadets who had completed training were still in employment after a period of a year, in positions which had been found for them.

Theron Commission, June, 1976. Page 273:

"It was repeatedly mentioned that in spite of intensive and nation-wide information dissemination about the obligation to register, there is yet a large group of young men who do not do so. According to witnesses, the apparent reluctance to attend this institution is due to the stigma which attaches itself to boys who have been there. Compulsory service, which applies to all young men and in which the boys at the centre will be included, will be more acceptable."

Conclusion

Ordinance 50 of 1828 provided that "no Hottentot or other free person of colour lawfully residing in this colony (Cape), shall be subject to any compulsory service to which other of his Majesty's subjects therein are not liable."

This ordinance repealed the "Vagrancy " proclamation of 1809 and several other proclamations of a similar nature, which required inter alia that persons of colour carry passes if they were to leave their fixed places of residence, this measure being enacted to protect the farmers' labour supply.

The Cadet Act which has reintroduced the concept of compulsory labour for Coloured workers, and the Prevention of Illegal Squatting Amendment Act which has reintroduced influx control for Coloured workers are a reversion to the situation as it was before 1828.

CARD opposes these measures and calls for their repeal. We realise that these are merely some of many measures reducing significant proportions of the South African population to unfree labour. African workers are already in many ways unfree. While until recently, Coloured workers have been relatively free it seems as if the State's intention is to reduce this freedom systematically in order to provide "trained and disciplined workers" for local and foreign entrepreneurs"[3]

Footnotes:

1. The Progressive Party which is based on strong mining capital support, had at the time a Coloured membership, hence their opposition to the Bill.
2. South African industry operates on a return of approximately 13%, compared with approximately 6% in other Western capitalist societies. Hence it would not have been sound business practice to replace unfree African labour with free Coloured labour which would have demanded higher wages and better working conditions. The initial

opposition of Western Cape businessmen to the replacement of African labour by Coloured labour was based on this fact. The Cadet Act came as an answer to this criticism.

3. The political effect of these acts is to encourage the unity of the Coloured and African labour force. Coloured workers, increasingly threatened by the State and its agencies, are likely to become more militant, and united action by Coloured and African workers to bring abourt political change is likely in the future. Given South African capitalism's almost total dependence on unfree labour, wide-ranging changes from above are impossible. Only the workers can remove the shackles that chain them.

communist viewpoint

Subscribe now...

6 issues a year $4.
(NEWSSTAND VALUE: $4.50)

COMMUNIST VIEWPOINT is a Marxist theoretical-political journal dealing with Canadian and world affairs from the standpoint of scientific socialism.

In Canada: Single Copy 75c; One Year $4.00; 2 Years $7.00 (Save $1.00). U.S. and Foreign: $5.00 1 Year; $8.50 2 Years. Half-price for students and unemployed. Enclose 15c with U.S. cheques.

Send to:

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY .....ZONE .....PROV. or STATE .....

Enc. $ ..... Bill me .....

Progress Subscription Service, 487 Adelaide St. W., Toronto M5V 1T4 Canada

Listen to the

VOICE OF THE AFRICAN NATIONAL CONGRESS AND UMKHONTO WE SIZWE

Radio Tanzania – External Service (Dar es Salaam)

on 15435 Khz **19 meter band**

10 p.m. South African time

Sundays, Mondays
Wednesdays, Fridays

Also available from

Inkululeko Publications
39 Goodge Street
London W1.

Moses Kotane: South African Revolutionary
by Brian Bunting. Price: South Africa R5.00, Africa £1.50, Britain £3.00, All other countries $8.00 (US).

50 Fighting Years: The South African Communist Party 1921-1971
by A. Lerumo. Price: North America $4.00, All other countries £1.25.

The Road to South African Freedom: Programme of the SACP
(Hard cover only) Price 50p.

International Meeting of Communist & Workers Parties, Moscow 1969.
Price £1.00 ($3.00).

Be informed by keeping in tune with-

Radio Berlin International

The Voice of the German Democratic Republic

RBI

Keeps you up to date on:

Life and developments in the Socialist German state and the socialist community.
Mankind's struggle for — Peace, National Liberation, Social Liberation.
Get to know the standpoint of the socialist German state by listening to
Radio Berlin International.

You can receive us in:—

Africa
in English, French, Swahili on the following metre bands: 49, 25, 19, 16 and 13.

Middle East
in Arabic on the following metre bands: 49, 30, 25, 19, 16 and 13.

South East Asia
in English and Hindi on the following metre bands: 25, 19, 16 and 13.

IMPORTANT: Please note that our frequencies are changed in March, May, September and November. The details are announced at the end of our programmes.

GDR, 116 Berlin

DIALOGUE ON SPAIN
Santiago Carrillo

1. Santiago Carrillo, general secretary of the Communist Party of Spain, in answering challenging questions from Regis Debray and Max Gallo, outlines the perspectives for democratic advance in Spain, and the way in which the Spanish Communist Party sees the problems facing the Communist movement as a whole.

hardback £4.50
paperback £2

FREDERIC JOLIOT-CURIE
Maurice Goldsmith

2. The authorised biography of Frederic Joliot, who with his wife Irene Curie was a leading figure in the discovery of artificial radio-activity. He joined the French Resistance, became a amember of the Communist Party, and was subsequently High Commissioner for Atomic Energy under de Gaulle, until his dismissal for political reasons. Thereafter he was a member of the World Peace Movement.

£6

LAWRENCE & WISHART LTD
46 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1
TELEPHONE 01-405 7565